

Zur deuteronomischen Zentralisationsformel

1. Jerusalem, der Ort, von dem die deuteronomischen Zentralisationsgesetze (abgesehen vom Samaritanus) zweifellos handeln, wird im Deuteronomium bekanntlich nie genannt, sondern mit bestimmten formelhaften Wendungen umschrieben (im folgenden: "Zentralisationsformel"). Am Anfang steht immer (*ham*)*māqôm* 'äšer. Der damit eingeleitete Relativsatz hat als Subjekt stets Jahwe (unausgedrückt / *JHWH* // *JHWH* 'ēlohēkā usw.) und als Verb *bhr* (*b^e*). Diese "Kurzform" kann auf doppelte Weise erweitert sein. Der Bereich, aus dem Jahwe seinen "Ort" auswählt, kann durch einen Hinweis auf Israels Stämme angedeutet sein. Das geschieht nur zweimal. Häufiger dagegen wird mit *l^e* ein Infinitiv angeschlossen, der den Gedanken des Auswählens näher bestimmt⁽¹⁾. Dafür werden zwei Wendungen gebraucht: 1. *l^ešakkēn š^emô šām*; 2. *lāsûm ('et) š^emô šām*. Liegt eine der beiden Infinitivergänzungen vor, kann man von einer "Langform" der Zentralisationsformel sprechen. Die so defi-

(¹) In der Literatur hat es sich eingebürgert, hier von "finaler Fortführung" oder "Zweckbestimmung" zu reden. Ich fürchte, man liest dabei die deuteronomischen Texte im Lichte von 1 Kön 8,16.44.48; 2 Kön 23,27. Dort wird deutlich zwischen der Erwählung der Stadt Jerusalem und der Gegenwart des Namens Jahwes im Tempel unterschieden. Dann verbindet man die beiden unterschiedenen Sachverhalte durch den Gedanken der Finalität. Aber im Deuteronomium gibt es solche Unterscheidungen und sekundäre Neuverbindungen noch nicht oder sogar bewußt nicht. *hammāqôm* meint, auf eine schillernde Weise, beides: Jerusalem und Tempel. So bleibt auch die Beziehung der beiden Verbalaussagen in der Schwebel. Das hebräische *l^e*, das ja keineswegs nur Finalität aussagt, leistet das ausgezeichnet. In unseren zur Differenzierung gezwungenen Sprachen scheint mir jede kausale (dadurch, daß), gerundivische (indem) oder den Maßstab anzeigende (insofern als) Übersetzung einer finalen (um zu) vorzuziehen zu sein. Noch besser würde man einfach juxtaaponieren ("und"). Dann blieben alle Möglichkeiten offen. Zur Offenheit der Bezeichnung *māqôm* in der deuteronomischen Zentralisationsformel vgl. H. WEIPPERT, "Der Ort, den Jahwe erwählen wird, um dort seinen Namen wohnen zu lassen', Die Geschichte einer alttestamentlichen Formel", *BZ* 24 (1980) 76-94. Eine beachtenswerte philologische Argumentation gegen die finale Übersetzung bietet A. R. HULST (Bespr. von TH. C. VRIEZEN, *Die Erwählung Israels nach dem Alten Testament*), *BO* 19 (1962) 59-62 (61):

nierte Formel ist, von einem wohl sehr späten Zusatz in Jos 9,27 abgesehen, innerhalb von Gen – 2 Kön nirgends außer im Dtn belegt. An allen vergleichbaren Stellen fehlt aus dem Bestand der "Kurzform" entweder *māqôm* oder das Element *bḥr*.

Es ist immer noch kontrovers, ob sich die verschiedenen Gestalten der Zentralisationsformel entwicklungsgeschichtlich hintereinander anordnen lassen, ja ob sie vielleicht sogar als Kriterien für verschiedene literarische Schichten in den deuteronomischen Gesetzen benutzt werden könnten.

Eine vergleichsweise unkomplizierte Position wird vertreten, wenn man die Belege der Langform mit *lāsûm* als deuteronomistisch, diejenigen mit *lšakkēn* als älter betrachtet⁽²⁾. Das läßt sich auch durch eine unbestreitbare Beobachtung begründen: *škn* Piel + *šēm*, von Jahwe ausgesagt, findet sich nur im Dtn und in Jer 7,12 und ist im Dtn die häufigere Wendung. Die Wendung *šwm* + *šēm*, von Jahwe ausgesagt, ist im Dtn die seltenere, kehrt aber in den dtr Passagen 1 Kön 9,3; 11,36; 14,21; 2 Kön 21,4.7, auf den Tempel und die Stadt Jerusalem bezogen, wieder. Hier könnte schichtenspezifischer Sprachgebrauch vorliegen. Für dtr Charakter der jeweiligen Kontexte im Dtn sprechen auch andere Gründe.

Vollausgebaut ist die hier sich andeutende Position, wenn die Kurzform als älteste Gestalt der Zentralisationsformel angesehen und frühen literarischen Schichten zugeordnet wird⁽³⁾. Da die strikte

(2) So R. DE VAUX, "Le lieu que Yahvé a choisi pour y établir son nom", *Das ferne und das nahe Wort*, FS. L. Rost (Hrsg. F. MAAS; BZAW 105; Berlin 1967) 219-228; M. METZGER, "Himmlische und irdische Wohnstatt Jahwes", *UF* 2 (1970) 139-158 (149-151); Y. ZAKOVITCH, "To Cause His Name to Dwell There" – "To Put His Name There" (hb.), *Tarbiz* 41 (1972) 338-340; B. HALPERN, "The Centralization Formula in Deuteronomy", *VT* (1981) 20-38. Bei den in der folgenden Anmerkung genannten Autoren bildet diese Unterscheidung natürlich meist auch einen Teil ihrer Gesamthypothese. H. SEEBASS, "*baḥar*", *TWAT* I, 592-608 (601), gehört insofern hierhin, als er beide Langformen zwar nebeneinanderstellt, aber annimmt, daß die Deuteronomisten nur noch diejenige mit *šwm* benutzt haben.

(3) So mit im Detail natürlich unterschiedlichen Annahmen: A. C. WELCH, *The Code of Deuteronomy, A New Theory of its Origin* (London 1927) 58; T. OESTREICHER, *Reichstempel und Ortsheligtümer in Israel* (BFCT 33; Gütersloh, 1930) 40f; F. HORST, *Das Privilegrecht Jahwes*, Rechtsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Deuteronomium (FRLANT 45; Göttingen 1930) 7-15 und 52; HULST, *Bespr. von VRIEZEN, Erwählung* (siehe Anm. 1) 61; P. R. MERENDINO, *Das deuteronomische Gesetz*, Eine literarkritische, gattungs- und überlieferungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Dt 12-26 (BBB

Durchführung dieser Annahme zu mancherlei Schwierigkeiten führte, kam es zu Hilfhypothesen: Daß die älteren Formen in jüngeren Schichten ebenfalls noch verwendet werden konnten⁽⁴⁾, oder daß die Kurzform nur überlieferungsgeschichtlich, nicht jedoch literarkritisch als ursprünglich zu betrachten sei⁽⁵⁾. Im Grunde wird aber in allen diesen Fällen eine Abfolge "Kurzform — Langform mit *škn* — Langform mit *šwm*" aufrechterhalten.

Eine entschieden geringere Zahl von Autoren lehnt derartige Hypothesen ab. K. Budde schrieb 1926, im Deuteronomium müsse die "Zweckbestimmung" an allen Stellen, wo sie fehle, "in Gedanken ergänzt werden"⁽⁶⁾. Bis in die Formulierungen hinein nahm dies 1958 F. Dummermuth auf, der dann allerdings riesige Spekulationen über eine Vorgeschichte der Langform entwickelte⁽⁷⁾. 1972 nahm H. Seebass diese Position bezüglich der Kurzform wieder auf: "Die Kurzform ist immer nur ein Hinweis auf eine der langen Formen"⁽⁸⁾. B. Halpern (1981) scheint ihr zuzuneigen⁽⁹⁾.

31; Bonn 1969) 382-387; G. NEBELING, *Die Schichten des deuteronomischen Gesetzeskorpus*, Eine traditions- und redaktionsgeschichtliche Analyse von Dtn 12-26 (Diss. Münster, 1970) 34-38; H. D. PREUSS, *Deuteronomium* (EdF 164; Darmstadt 1982) 14.

(4) So M. ROSE, *Der Ausschließlichkeitsanspruch Jahwes*, Deuteronomische Schultheologie und die Volksfrömmigkeit in der späten Königszeit (BWANT 106; Stuttgart 1975) 77-87.

(5) So G. SEITZ, *Redaktionsgeschichtliche Studien zum Deuteronomium* (BWANT 93; Stuttgart 1971) 212-222; H. WEIPPERT, "Ort" (siehe Anm. 1) 78f. Vgl. SEITZ 213: "Es läßt sich aber nicht nachweisen, daß die eine Zeit diese, die andere jene Form der māqôm-Formel gebraucht hat". Ebd. 214: "Es liegt nahe, in der kurzen māqôm-Formel ohne jede Zweckbestimmung die Urgestalt zu sehen; denn in ihr begegnen nur die allen Formen dieser Wendung gemeinsamen Bestandteile. Das kann aber nur ein überlieferungsgeschichtliches und kein literarkritisches Urteil sein". Ebd. 218-220 folgen dann belegfreie Spekulationen über die vordeuteronomische Existenz der Kurzform.

(6) "Das Deuteronomium und die Reform König Josias", *ZAW* 44 (1926) 177-224 (186).

(7) "Zur deuteronomischen Kulttheologie und ihren Voraussetzungen", *ZAW* 70 (1958) 59-98 (61).

(8) L.c. (Siehe Anm. 2) 601. Nach ihm "dürfte es nicht geraten sein, die Kurzformel als Ursprung der dtn Kultformel anzusehen, da sie überall unmißverständlich das zentrale Heiligtum meint, als solche aber nicht eindeutig auf ein Heiligtum führt. . . Als Grundform kommt nur eine der beiden Formen . . . in Betracht, die die Kurzform durch einen finalen Infinitivsatz erweitern" (600).

(9) "Centralization Formula" (siehe Anm. 2) 23: "It is arguable (though

Ich möchte in den folgenden Ausführungen einige Beobachtungen und Überlegungen vorlegen, die eher zugunsten der Minoritätsmeinung sprechen und zur Vorsicht gegenüber der Verwendung der deuteronomischen Zentralisationsformel im Rahmen literarkritischer Analysen oder überlieferungsgeschichtlicher Spekulationen raten⁽¹⁰⁾.

2. Um ein Referenzsystem zu haben, gebe ich in einer Tabelle eine Übersicht über die Belege der Zentralisationsformel im Dtn nach dem masoretischen Text (Tabelle I)⁽¹¹⁾. Ich nummeriere die Zentralisationsgesetze durch (römische Zahlen)⁽¹²⁾, ebenso die Belege der Formel selbst (arabische Zahlen). Ich schließe die in vielem analog zu den Zentralisationsgesetzen gebaute Anordnung Moses 31,10-13 ein, obwohl sie außerhalb des Gesetzeskorpus steht. Da sie die Verlesung des Gesetzestextes regelt, ist ihr Ort außerhalb desselben durchaus natürlich⁽¹³⁾. Im Folgenden noch einige Bemerkungen zur Tabelle.

An die Kurzform der Zentralisationsformel in der Erweiterungsgestalt von 12,14 erinnert die Formulierung des Gesetzes über die Nichtauslieferung eines flüchtigen Sklaven oder (bei anderer Interpretation) politischen Flüchtlings in 23,16f (17)⁽¹⁴⁾. Es mag bewußt pa-

not rigorously demonstrable) that the phrase 'the place that Yhwh choses' ... represents an abbreviated allusion to one of these longer descriptions".

⁽¹⁰⁾ Für die Lektüre einer früheren Form des Manuskripts und wichtige Hinweise danke ich G. Braulik (Wien), R. I. Caplice (Rom) und S. F. Pisano (Rom).

⁽¹¹⁾ Da zumindest in 12,5 der MT noch recht späte Veränderungen erlitten zu haben scheint und ich auch für diese Tabelle zumindest einen kleinen Schritt hinter sie zurückgehen möchte (vgl. die Bemerkungen zur Tabelle), handelt es sich genau genommen nicht um den MT, sondern um die im MT repräsentierte Texttradition — die aber noch von der samaritanischen oder der hinter der LXX stehenden unterschieden werden muß.

⁽¹²⁾ Für ihre Abgrenzung halte ich mich an die deutsche *Einheitsübersetzung* (Stuttgart 1980).

⁽¹³⁾ Oft nehmen Divergenzen schon hier ihren Anfang. So hat G. VON RAD, *Das fünfte Buch Mose*, Deuteronomium (ATD 8; Göttingen 1964) 11, bei der Begründung seiner These, die Zentralisation spiele im Deuteronomium gar keine so große Rolle, die Belege der Zentralisationsformel in 26,2 und 31,11 offenbar schlicht übersehen. Auch HALPERN, "Centralization Formula" (siehe Anm. 2), erwähnt 26,2 nie.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Diese Stelle spielte, vor allem durch OESTREICHERS Publikationen, eine wichtige Rolle in der Diskussion um die Kultzentralisation während der zwanziger Jahre. Vgl. zuletzt PREUSS, *Deuteronomium* (siehe Anm. 3) 13.

TABELLE I.
Die Zentralisationsformel im MT

Gesetz	Stelle	<i>mqwm</i>	<i>bḥr</i>	<i>JHWH</i>	<i>'lhjm</i>	<i>šbtjm</i>	<i>škn</i>	<i>šwm</i>
I. 12,4-7	1. 12,5	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
II. 12,8-12	2. 12,11	+	+	+	+		+	
III. 12,13-19	3. 12,14	+	+	+		+		
	4. 12,18	+	+	+	+			
IV. 12,20-28	5. 12,21	+	+	+	+			+
	6. 12,26	+	+	+				
V. 14,22-27	7. 14,23	+	+				+	
	8. 14,24	+	+	+	+			+
	9. 14,25	+	+	+	+			
VI. 15,19-23	10. 15,20	+	+	+				
VII. 16,1-8	11. 16,2	+	+	+			+	
	12. 16,6	+	+	+	+		+	
	13. 16,7	+	+	+	+			
VIII. 16,9-12	14. 16,11	+	+	+	+		+	
IX. 16,13-15	15. 16,15	+	+	+				
X. 16,16f	16. 16,16	+	+					
XI. 17,8-13	17. 17,8	+	+	+	+			
	18. 17,10	+	+	+				
XII. 18,1-8	19. 18,6	+	+	+				
XIII. 26,1-11	20. 26,2	+	+	+	+		+	
XIV. 31,10-13	21. 31,11	+	+					

rallele Formulierung vorliegen. Trotzdem ist dieser Text nicht unter die Belege der Tabelle einzureihen.

Die beiden unterschiedlichen Formulierungen des Bereiches, aus dem Jahwe seinen *māqôm* auswählen wird, *mikkol šibtêkem* (12,5) und *b'ahad šbātèkā* (12,14), habe ich nicht verschiedenen Spalten zugeteilt. Wie 18,6 *mē'ahad š'ārèkā mikkol jšrā'ēl* zeigt, handelt es sich nur um zwei Aspekte einer und derselben Sache.

Es gibt zwei weitere Belege des Wortes *māqôm*, und zwar ohne Erweiterungen, die auf die zentrale Kultstätte bezogen werden könnten: 12,3 *hammāqôm hahû*’, wenn man hier ein Herausspringen aus der Mosesituation in die der liturgischen Proklamation im Jerusalemer Heiligtum sehen will, und 26,9 *’el hammāqôm hazzeh*, wo etwa Raschi schlicht auslegt: *zeh bêt hammiqdāš*. Aber in 12,3 mag Singular mit distributivem Sinn vorliegen, und es mögen alle die einzelnen kanaanäischen Heiligtümer gemeint sein, von denen 12,2f handelt. In 26,9 mag ein gewollter Zusammenhang mit der Zentralisationsformel in 26,2 vorliegen. Doch hat *māqôm* im Parallelismus mit *hā’āreš hazzō’t* zugleich einen breiteren Sinn (vgl. auch Ex 3,8), und es geht hier nicht eigentlich um den einzigen Kultort. In der Tabelle haben 12,3 und 26,9 jedenfalls nichts zu suchen.

Für 12,5 rechne ich innerhalb der masoretischen Tradition selbst mit relativ später syntaktischer Umordnung durch Setzung des Atnach unter *šām*: So wurde *lšiknô* von der Zentralisationsformel abgespalten⁽¹⁵⁾. Ferner scheint auch die nominale Auffassung von *lšknw* noch nicht im protomasoretischen Text verankert zu sein⁽¹⁶⁾. Es mag offen bleiben, ob man für dieses Frühstadium der masoretischen Texttradition mit einer Aussprachetradition rechnen muß, die *lšiknô*, *lšoknô* oder *lšakknô* entsprochen hätte⁽¹⁷⁾. Auf jeden Fall

(15) Die Londoner Polyglotte setzt beim Tg. Onq. zwar ein dem MT entsprechendes Atnach, aber das scheint sekundär zu sein. Vom reinen Text her bleiben alle Targumim für verschiedenste Interpretationen offen, wie die neueren Übersetzungen zeigen. A. Díez MACHO, R. LE DÉAUT und M. McNAMARA / M. MAHER ziehen bei der Übersetzung von Tg. Neof. in A. Díez MACHO, *Ms. Neophyti, Targum Palestinense*, Ms. de la Biblioteca Vaticana, Edition Princeps, V. Deuteronomio (Madrid 1978) 116, 353 und 490 die *lšknw* entsprechenden Elemente ganz in die Zentralisationsformel hinein. Ebenso R. LE DÉAUT, *Targum du Pentateuque*, Traductions des deux recensions palestiniennes complètes, IV. Deutéronome (SC 271; Paris 1980) 115, für den Tg. Ps.-J. I. DRAZIN, *Targum Onkelos to Deuteronomy*, An English Translation of the Text with Analysis and Commentary (s.l. [New York] 1982) 144, beginnt im Tg. Onq. sogar schon mit *tmn* einen zweiten Satz.

(16) Die verschiedenen Targumim bezeugen alle eine nominale Auffassung. Dagegen übersetzt die Vg, die im allgemeinen einem protomasoretischen Text folgt, verbal. Dies scheint mir relevant zu sein, obwohl sie am Ende des Verses von den beiden Verben des MT nur *wb’t* übersetzt und, was die Wortwahl angeht, die Zentralisationsformel variierend wiedergibt.

(17) Ein *lšakknô*, seit C. STEUERNAGEL meist konjiziert, scheint mir nach einem von einem Infinitiv abhängigen Infinitiv nicht nötig zu sein. Der zu erwartende Infinitiv Qal von *škn* wäre *lšoknô*, doch könnte auch eine Neben-

dürfte es sich hier, beim ersten Vorkommen der Zentralisationsformel, um eine alle Variationen einschließende Vollgestalt handeln — mit in der deuteronomischen Sprache durchaus möglicher Infinitivverketzung⁽¹⁸⁾.

G. von Rad rechnet in seinem Kommentar auch das Gesetz über die Asylstädte Dtn 19,1-13 zu den Zentralisationsgesetzen⁽¹⁹⁾. Da dort jedoch nicht nur die Zentralisationsformel, sondern auch das gesamte, diese Gesetze in ihrem inneren Ablauf kennzeichnende Wallfahrtsschema fehlt, nehme ich den Text nicht in die Tabelle auf.

3. Eine erste Warnung zur Vorsicht bei der Verwendung der Zentralisationsformel im Zusammenhang von Literarkritik und Überlieferungsgeschichte ergibt sich beim Studium der textkritischen Situation⁽²⁰⁾. Hier zeigt es sich, daß die deuteronomische Zentralisationsformel offenbar theologisch hochbrisant war und zu tiefgehenden interpretatorischen und vielleicht auch textlichen Eingriffen Anlaß gegeben hat — mehr als der normale Textbestand des Buches. Wir sind uns also über die Ursprünglichkeit des MT hier weniger sicher. Ich gehe die verschiedenen Textzeugnisse im einzelnen durch.

Der MT selbst hat durch Atnach-Setzung und möglicherweise auch Umvokalisierung (vgl. oben unter 2.) aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach in 12,5 folgende Aussage erzeugen wollen: «Nach dem Ort, den Jahwe, euer Gott, aus allen euren Stammesgebieten auswählen wird, indem er dort seinen Namen anbringt, nach seiner Wohnung sollt ihr

form *l'siknô* existieren. Vgl. die Argumentation bei S. R. DRIVER, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy* (ICC; Edinburgh 1895) 140.

⁽¹⁸⁾ Vgl. Dtn 1,33; 4,14.34.38; 6,1.24 u.ö.

⁽¹⁹⁾ *Das fünfte Buch Mose* (siehe Anm. 13) 11.

⁽²⁰⁾ Vgl. W. CASPARI, "Textkritische Beleuchtung eines Ausgangspunktes der Auseinandersetzung über das Deuteronomium," *Beiträge zur Religionsgeschichte und Archäologie Palästinas* (FS. E. Sellin; Leipzig 1927) 25-35. C. ist allerdings im ersten Teil des Artikels vor allem auf Dtn 23,17, im dritten auf Ex 20,24 konzentriert. Eines seiner Hauptziele ist, für die Zentralisationsformeln in Dtn 12 nachzuweisen, daß dort (mit Ausnahme von 12,5) *māqôm* ursprünglich nicht determiniert war. Er argumentiert hauptsächlich von eklektisch herangezogenen mittelalterlichen hebräischen und griechischen Varianten her — eine heute so nicht mehr anwendbare Methode. Die Fragestellung ist stark dem Diskussionsstand der zwanziger Jahre verpflichtet (vgl. oben Anm. 14). Die Frage nach Kurz- und Langform und ihre weiteren Implikationen tauchen nicht auf.

suchen, und du sollst dorthin kommen⁽²¹⁾”. Hier ist die im Deuteronomium fehlende⁽²²⁾ Vorstellung vom Wohnen Gottes im Tempel, die in 1 Kön 8,27-30 von einem deuteronomistischen Theologen sogar ausdrücklich in Frage gestellt wird, offenbar nachträglich bewußt eingetragen worden. Das Suffix in *l'siknô* dürfte sich auf Jahwe, nicht auf seinen “Namen” beziehen. Es ist keineswegs ausgeschlossen, daß auf die Schekina-Vorstellung angespielt werden sollte, die in den textlich dem MT sehr nahestehenden verschiedenen Targumim offen vorliegt.

Wenn man von den Infinitivergänzungen der Kurzform absieht, folgen Tg. Neof., Tg. Ps.-J. und Tg. Onq.⁽²³⁾, ganz wenige und kleine Varianten ausgenommen⁽²⁴⁾, genau dem MT. Dagegen kennen sie alle keinen Unterschied zwischen der Langform mit *škn* und der Langform mit *šwm*. Sie haben die Langform immer und nur, wo auch der MT sie hat, und sie übersetzen sie immer gleich:

Tg. Neof.: *lmšrjrh 'jqr škjntjh*

Tg. Ps.-J.: *l' šr'h škjntjh*

Tg. Onq.: *l' šr'h škjntjh*

(²¹) Vermutlich soll der Text als Hyperbaton gelesen werden. Dann wäre das erste Prädikat der ersten Ortsbestimmung (“Nach dem Ort, den Jahwe..., sollt ihr suchen”), das zweite Prädikat der zweiten Ortsbestimmung zuzuordnen (“nach seiner Wohnung, dorthin sollst du kommen”). Zu einem anderen Hyperbaton im Dtn (17,18f) vgl. J. BECKER, “Einige Hyperbata im Alten Testament”, *BZ* 17 (1973) 257-263.

(²²) Mehr läßt sich kaum sagen. Oft wurde angenommen, in der Zentralisationsformel mit *škn* entwickle das Dtn gegen die Wohntheologie eine Theologie der Einwohnung allein des Jahwenamens im Tempel. Aber vgl. R. DE VAUX, “Le lieu” (siehe Anm. 2), und, weiterführend, H. WEIPPERT, “Der Ort” (siehe Anm. 1); A. S. VAN DER WOUDE, “Gibt es eine Theologie des Jahwenamens im Deuteronomium?”, *Übersetzung und Deutung*, Studien zum Alten Testament und seiner Umwelt (FS. A. R. Hulst; Nijkerk 1977) 204-210. Durch die Zentralisationsformel ist eine Wohnvorstellung weder ausgeschlossen noch bekämpft. Allerhöchstens ist relevant, daß sie nicht ausdrücklich entwickelt wird.

(²³) Der Fragmententargum ist nur für 17,8 belegt, wo er genau dem MT folgt (Kurzform).

(²⁴) Nennenswert ist eigentlich nur, daß Tg. Neof. in 15,20 zu “Jahwe” noch “dein Gott” hinzufügt, während Tg. Ps.-J. (Add. 27031) dieses Element in 12,11 sogar ausläßt. Schwer zu deuten, aber in unserem Zusammenhang unerheblich, ist, daß Tg. Neof. und Tg. Ps.-J. in 12,5 für MT *l' hmqw m* die Übersetzung *l'r'* haben, Add. 27031 nach LE DÉAUT, *Targum du Pentateuque IV* (siehe Anm. 15) 206, auch in 26,2.

In 12,5 haben sie für MT *lšknw*:

Tg. Neof.: *lbjt mwqdšh*

Tg. Ps.-J.: *lbjt škjntjh*

Tg. Onq.: *lbjt škjntjh*

Jahwe hat nach den Targumim den einen Ort auserwählt, um dort "seine Schekina" oder "die Herrlichkeit seiner Schekina" "ruhen zu lassen". Hier ist die Wohntheologie also in einer neu entwickelten Form überall neu eingetragen worden⁽²⁵⁾.

Angesichts der genauen Entsprechung zum MT im Bereich der Kurzform wird man annehmen können, daß die Targumim auch im Bereich der Infinitivergänzungen den MT vor sich hatten. Doch ist dies auch wieder nicht hundertprozentig sicher, da sich zeigen wird, daß die masoretische Differenzierung zwischen Aussagen mit *škn* und Aussagen mit *šwm* sich auch in anderen Texttraditionen nicht spiegelt. Dieser Sachverhalt könnte der älteren targumischen Tradition bewußt gewesen sein. Auf jeden Fall sah sie keinen Grund, zwischen den beiden Vokabeln zu unterscheiden. Sie gaben beide die Basis für ihre Schekina-Theologie her⁽²⁶⁾.

Aus Qumran gibt es nur ein einziges für die Zentralisationsformel relevantes Fragment: 1Q 4.14: 16,6 (DJD I 56) aus 1Q Deut^a(27). Es fügt dem Verb *bhr* die an dieser Stelle im MT nicht belegte Ergänzung *bw* hinzu. Es gehört schon in den Bereich jener Textformen, die gegenüber dem MT eine Tendenz aufweisen, die verschiedenen Gestalten der Zentralisationsformel durch Erweiterungen einander anzugleichen.

Zum Samaritanischen Pentateuch (SP) vgl. Tabelle II. Daß der SP in der Zentralisationsformel das Verb *bhr* aus dem "Imperfekt"

⁽²⁵⁾ Zur Schekina-Theologie vgl. vor allem A. M. GOLDBERG, *Untersuchungen über die Vorstellung von der Schekinah in der frühen rabbinischen Literatur — Talmud und Midrasch* (StudJud 5; Berlin 1969). Zur Schekina in den Targumim: ders., "Die spezifische Verwendung des Terminus Schekinah im Targum Onkelos als Kriterium einer relativen Datierung", *Judaica* 19 (1963) 43-61.

⁽²⁶⁾ Eher gegen eine vom MT abweichende Textbasis spricht die Tatsache, daß Tg. Ps.-J. und Tg. Onq. auch in Ex 20,24 (MT: *zkr* Hifil) ihre Gestalt der deuteronomischen Zentralisationsformel eintragen (anders Tg. Neof.). In dieser Sache ist ihnen theologische Konsistenz also wichtiger als Texttreue.

⁽²⁷⁾ 1Q Deut^a 14,24f (1Q 4.12) und Mur. Deut 12,26 sind für die Zentralisationsformel unergiebig.

TABELLE II.
Die Zentralisationsformel im SP

Nr.	<i>mqwm</i>	<i>bḥr</i>	<i>JHWH</i>	<i>ʾlhjm</i>	<i>šbt jm</i>	<i>škn</i>	<i>šwm</i>
1.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
2.	+	+	+	+		+	
3.	+	+	+	(+)	+		
4.	+	+	+	+			
5.	+	+	+	+		+	
6.	+	+	+				
7.	+	+	+	+		+	
8.	+	+	+	+		+	
9.	+	+	+	+			
10.	+	+	+				
11.	+	+	+	+		+	
12.	+	+	+	+		+	
13.	+	+	+	+			
14.	+	+	+	+		+	
15.	+	+	+	+			
16.	+	+					
17.	+	+	+	+			
18.	+	+	+	+			
19.	+	+	+	(+)			
20.	+	+	+	+		+	
21.	+	+					

ins "Perfekt" versetzt und so das Heiligtum vom erst unter David eroberten Zion auf den mit allen Väterkultstätten zu identifizierenden heiligen Berg Garizim⁽²⁸⁾ verlegt, ist weithin bekannt und muß hier nicht diskutiert werden. Im übrigen gehört der SP auch für die Zentralisationsformel zu den erweiternd-harmonisierenden Texttradi-

⁽²⁸⁾ Zur Auffassung vom Garizim in der samaritanischen Theologie vgl. J. MACDONALD, *The Theology of the Samaritans* (London 1964) 327-333.

tionen. So wird Jahwe, das Subjekt des Relativsatzes über die Erwählung, in 16,2,15; 17,10 (und in einzelnen Handschriften auch in 12,14; 18,6) durch "Elohim" erweitert, in 14,23 wird der gesamte Ausdruck "Jahwe, dein Gott" überhaupt erst eingesetzt. Die im MT im Dtn stets ohne 't stehende Infinitivergänzung *lešakkēn šēmō šām* erhält in Angleichung an 12,5 *lšjm 't šmw šm* durchgehend diese Partikel.

Bei einem weiteren Phänomen ist es nicht ganz so klar, ob es sich um Harmonisierung handelt, denn es liegt keine Erweiterung vor. Gegenüber der Infinitivergänzung mit *šwm* in MT 12,21; 14,24 liest der SP auch an diesen beiden Stellen *škn*. Nur noch in 12,5 hat er *šjm*. Ist das Harmonisierung und betrachtet man *škn* als das ältere, deuteronomische, *šwm* als das jüngere, deuteronomistische Verb, dann müßte später in der Texttradition eine Art Tendenzwende stattgefunden haben: der archaischere Ausdruck müßte sich durchgesetzt haben. So bleibt auch die andere Möglichkeit offen: Daß hier der SP ein älteres Textstadium spiegelt als der MT, bei dem aus irgendeinem Grunde irgendwann an zwei Stellen das jüngere *šwm* statt *škn* eingesetzt worden wäre⁽²⁹⁾.

Noch komplizierter als beim SP ist die Lage in der LXX. Vgl. zunächst Tabelle III. Die gegenseitige Angleichung im Bereich der Kurzform, und zwar durch Erweiterungen, führt zu fast durchgehender Gleichheit der Stellen. *Κυριος* ist überall, wo das Subjekt unausgedrückt war, ergänzt: 14,23; 16,16; 31,11. Zu *κυριος* ist in 12,14. 26; 14,23; 15,20; 16,15; 17,10 *ο θεος υμων/σου* hinzugefügt. In einem Teil der Handschriften tritt letzteres auch schon an den dann noch verbleibenden Stellen 16,16; 18,6; 31,11 auf. Daraus sieht man, daß der Angleichungsprozeß zum Teil innerhalb der LXX stattfand. Aber daraus folgt nicht, daß er nicht zum Teil auch schon vor der Übersetzung ins Griechische lag.

Mit einem solchen Angleichungsprozeß muß man bei der LXX nun offenbar — über das, was im SP beobachtbar ist, hinaus — auch bezüglich der Infinitivergänzungen rechnen. Hält man sich an J. W. Wevers⁽³⁰⁾, dann fand die LXX über den MT hinaus die Lang-

⁽²⁹⁾ Nicht als Harmonisierung läßt sich auch ein anderes Phänomen erklären: In 16,16 kommt gegen MT *bhr* ergänzendes *bw* hinzu, in 17,8 fehlt es aber gegen MT.

⁽³⁰⁾ *Deuteronomium* (Adiuvante U. QUAST; Septuaginta Gottingensis III, 2; Göttingen 1977).

TABELLE III.
Die Zentralisationsformel in der LXX

Nr.	τοπος	εκλεξηται	κυριος	θεος	φυλοι	επικληθηναι	επονομασαι
1.	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
2.	+	+	+	+		+	
3.	+	+	+	+	+		
4.	+	+	+	+			
5.	+	+	+	+		+	
6.	+	+	+	+		+	
7.	+	+	+	+		+	
8.	+	+	+	+		+	
9.	+	+	+	+		(+)	
10.	+	+	+	+			
11.	+	+	+	+		+	
12.	+	+	+	+		+	
13.	+	+	+	+			
14.	+	+	+	+		+	
15.	+	+	+	+		(+)	
16.	+	+	+	(+)			
17.	+	+	+	+		+	
18.	+	+	+	+		+	
19.	+	+	+	(+)			
20.	+	+	+	+		+	
21.	+	+	+	(+)			

form schon vor in 12,26; 17,8.10. Dagegen könnten die nur in einem Teil der Handschriften belegten Langformen in 14,25; 16,15 auf erweiternde Harmonisierung innerhalb der LXX-Tradition zurückgehen. Schwankungen der Textbezeugung in 17,8.10 hängen vielleicht mit Redaktionen zusammen, die an die kürzere masoretische Texttradition anglichen.

Doch nun kommen auch in der LXX andere Erscheinungen hinzu, die nicht so sicher auf Harmonisierungstendenz zurückgeführt

werden können, da in ihnen das Element der Erweiterung fehlt. Die Nennung der Stämme in 12,5 und 12,14 ist, gegen MT und SP, fast gleich formuliert. Vor allem aber scheint in der Vorlage der LXX in 12,21; 14,24 ebenso wie im SP nicht *šwm*, sondern *škn* gestanden zu haben. Denn die Übersetzung bietet hier keinerlei Variante zu den anderen Langformen. Das gilt auch von den über den MT hinausgehenden Langformbelegen (vgl. oben). Gerade weil der SP das gleiche Phänomen auf hebräisch bietet, muß man wohl mit einer Vorlage rechnen, die *šwm* nur in 12,5 gehabt zu haben scheint. Die schon bezüglich des SP festgestellte Möglichkeit, daß nicht die drei Vorkommen von *šwm* im MT, sondern die Beschränkung von *šwm* auf 12,5 den ursprünglicheren Zustand darstellt, gewinnt an Gewicht.

Die Lage wird dadurch nochmals komplizierter, daß auch in der LXX theologische Interessen angenommen werden müssen. Die Dtn-LXX hat weder die in den Königsbüchern für *šwm* + *šēm* (bei Jahwe als Subjekt) übliche und auch hier zu erwartende Wiedergabe mit $\tau\theta\eta\mu\iota$ (vgl. 1 Kön 9,3; 11,36; 14,21; 4 Kön 21,4.7) noch die in Jer 7,12; Neh 1,9 vorhandene und auch hier zu erwartende Wiedergabe von *škn* Piel + *šēm* (bei Jahwe als Subjekt) mit $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\kappa\eta\nu\omega$ (vgl. auch Num 14,30; 35,34; Ps 78,60) gebraucht⁽³¹⁾. Vielmehr lautet die Zentralisationsformel in Dtn 12,5: $\tau\omicron\nu\ \tau\omicron\pi\omicron\nu\ \omicron\nu\ \alpha\nu\ \epsilon\kappa\lambda\epsilon\zeta\eta\tau\alpha\iota\ \kappa\upsilon\text{-}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \omicron\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma\ \upsilon\mu\omega\nu\ \dots\ \epsilon\pi\omicron\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\varsigma\alpha\iota\ \tau\omicron\ \omicron\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\ \epsilon\pi\iota\kappa\lambda\eta\theta\eta\nu\alpha\iota$. Bei allen anderen Belegen der Langform lautet sie: $\omicron\ \tau\omicron\pi\omicron\varsigma\ \omicron\nu\ \alpha\nu\ \epsilon\kappa\lambda\epsilon\zeta\eta\tau\alpha\iota\ \kappa\upsilon\text{-}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \omicron\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma\ \upsilon\mu\omega\nu\ \epsilon\pi\iota\kappa\lambda\eta\theta\eta\nu\alpha\iota\ \tau\omicron\ \omicron\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota$. Das sind nicht Übersetzungen, das sind Deutungen. Die Tendenz ist umgekehrt wie beim Targum. Die LXX will möglichst weit von einer Wohntheologie weg. $\epsilon\pi\omicron\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\zeta\omega$ steht sonst für *qr' bšēm*, $\epsilon\pi\iota\kappa\alpha\lambda\epsilon\omega$ steht ebenfalls für *qr'*. Die LXX orientiert sich offenbar an der Idee der Ausrufung und Anrufung des Gottesnamens beim Kult an heiliger Stätte. Doch läßt sich noch Genauereres sagen. Bei der Übersetzung des Altargesetzes des Bundesbuches hatte die LXX für *zkr* Hifil in Ex 20,24 eine völlig ungewöhnliche Übersetzung gewählt, nämlich $\epsilon\pi\omicron\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\varsigma\omega$ ⁽³²⁾. Dafür sehe ich nur einen denkbaren Grund: Sie wollte an die ganz kurz vorher stehende Notiz über den Bau

⁽³¹⁾ Ps 74,7 *mškn šmk* wird in der LXX zu $\tau\omicron\ \sigma\kappa\eta\nu\omega\mu\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \omicron\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon$.

⁽³²⁾ Für die normale Übersetzung des Verbs vgl. 2 Sam 18,18: $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\nu\alpha\mu\eta\sigma\alpha\iota\ \tau\omicron\ \omicron\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$.

eines Jahwealtars durch Mose in Ex 17,15 anknüpfen, wo επονομαζω korrekt *qr' šēm* übersetzt: "Mose erbaute einen Altar des Herrn (so in LXX!) und nannte seinen (des Herrn?) Namen: Der Herr ist meine Zuflucht (καταφυγη)". In Dtn 12,5, wiederum am Anfang eines Gesetzeskorpus, griff der Dtn-Übersetzer nun offenbar genau so großzügig auf die freie Übersetzung seines Exodus-Kollegen zurück, wählte επονομαζω nunmehr als Übersetzung von *šwm* und schuf damit eine genaue Parallele zwischen den beiden Gesetzeskorpora und ihren den Kult regelnden Anfängen. In ähnlicher Weise dürfte der Dtn-Übersetzer für die Wiedergabe von *škn* durch das Passiv von επικαλεω auf Ex 29,45f, den Abschluß des Altargesetzes der priesterschriftlichen Sinaiperikope, zurückgegriffen haben. Dort war *škn* Qal (Subjekt: Jahwe) zweimal durch επικαλεω übersetzt worden. Vermutlich war dort die eigentliche Entscheidung gefallen, die Theologie des Wohnens Gottes im Tempel als Theologie der Anrufung seines Namens zu interpretieren. Man hat sich dabei wohl auf die Erzählungen vom Jahwekult in der Genesis beziehen wollen: vgl. Gen 4,26 (Anfang des Jahwekults); 12,8 (Abram in Betel); 21,33 (in Beerscheba); 26,25 (Isaak in Beerscheba); 33,20 (Jakob in Sichem). Damit war eine Kontinuität zwischen dem Jahwekult der Erzväter und dem neuen, einen, am Sinai für das wandernde Israel gestifteten Heiligtum hergestellt. Die gleichlautende Normalform der deuteronomischen Zentralisationsformel zog die Linie dann weiter zum zukünftigen Jerusalemer Zentralheiligtum aus. In den Genesisbelegen steht επικαλεω allerdings in aktiver, nicht wie in Ex 29 und im Dtn in passiver Form. Deshalb mag auch noch bei der Formulierung der Schlüsselstelle Ex 29,45f die wichtige Stelle über die Bundeslade in 2 Sam 6,2 vor Augen gestanden haben. Hier steht *qr' Nifal*, das die LXX mit dem Passiv von επικαλεω wiedergibt. Ferner findet sich hier das für die Zentralisationsformel wichtige und in Ex 29,45f nicht vorhandene Wort *šēm* = ονομα⁽³³⁾.

(33) Da in Ex 29,45f das Passiv von επικαλεω für das Qal von *škn* steht, könnte man sogar die Idee verfolgen, daß auch im Dtn ursprünglich Qal, nicht das ja auch in sich schwierige Piel von *škn* gestanden habe (wie es in 12,5 vermutlich auch zu belassen ist — vgl. oben). Man könnte weiter konjizieren, daß *šēm* erst sekundär in die Zentralisationsformel eingesetzt worden sei — vgl. das durchgehende Fehlen der Partikel 'et im MT, und zwar nur bei *škn*, nicht bei *šwm*. Dann hätte die Langform der Zentralisationsformel ursprünglich schlicht die Vorstellung des Wohntempels bezeugt, und erst ein

Wir haben es hier also mit einem sich über den ganzen LXX-Pentateuch erstreckenden Auslegungssystem zu tun. Dabei wurde recht großzügig über sprachliche Differenzen der hebräischen Vorlage um der theologischen Sache willen hinweggesehen. Da die LXX uns textgeschichtlich viel weiter zurückführt als andere Zeugen, können wir schließen, daß die deuteronomische Zentralisationsformel schon recht früh ein theologisch heißer Text war. Damit vermindert sich die Sicherheit darüber, ob hier der Text wenigstens in den Anfängen der Textgeschichte so friedlich und unverändert weitergegeben wurde wie an theologisch weniger belangvollen Stellen.

Zusammenfassung zur LXX: Das Verhältnis zwischen Kurz- und Langformen sowie innerhalb der Langformen zwischen Formeln mit *škn* und Formeln mit *šwm* ist anders als beim MT. Dabei können zwei festgestellte Tendenzen verantwortlich sein: die zur gegenseitigen Angleichung und die zur theologischen (den ganzen Pentateuch übergreifenden) Neudeutung. Aber es ist andererseits keineswegs sicher, daß darauf der gesamte Befund zurückgeführt werden kann — wie ein Seitenblick auf analoge Sachverhalte im SP, ja sogar in den Targumim zeigt.

Am Ende noch ein Wort zur Vg. Hieronymus scheint von der theologischen Brisanz der Zentralisationsformel innerhalb des Judentums keine Ahnung gehabt zu haben. Da er nur an einer Stelle den Textbestand des MT überschreitet (16,2: *deus tuus*), lag ihm zweifellos ein protomasoretischer Text vor. In 12,5 übersetzt er recht wurzelnah. Dann lehnt er sich für die Langform in 12,11.21 an die dem Dtn fremden Formulierungen von 1 Kön 8,16; 2 Kön 23,27 an, folgt in 14,23 der Linie der LXX, läßt im folgenden Vers wohl aus stilistischen Gründen die Langformzusätze aus, bringt in 16,2.6.11 die Wohnvorstellung und kehrt in 26,2 zur Anrufung des Namens zurück. Wegen dieser Nonchalance wird man auch nichts daraus folgern können, daß er in 12,11 und 21 die gleiche Übersetzung hat, obwohl dort im MT einmal *škn*, einmal *šwm* steht⁽³⁴⁾.

früher Tiqqun Soferim hätte die Formel in die im MT bezeugte Gestalt gebracht. So A. GEIGER, *Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel in ihrer Abhängigkeit von der inneren Entwicklung des Judentums* (Frankfurt a. M. [1857] ² 1928) 320-322. Doch die beobachtete Tendenz der LXX zur theologischen Systembildung dürfte den Befund einfacher erklären. Allerdings ist zuzugeben, daß dann eine Erklärung des durchgehenden Fehlens von *'et* nach *škn* (vgl. dagegen Neh 1,9) fehlt.

⁽³⁴⁾ Die Neovulgata hat hier mit eisernem Besen masoretische Zucht

Alles in allem ergibt der textkritische Vergleich sicher, daß wir – von 12,5 abgesehen – uns am vernünftigsten immer noch an den MT halten. Es gibt nirgends überzeugendere Alternativen. Doch zugleich müssen wir wissen, daß wir, wenn wir uns an ihn halten, notgedrungen auf schwankendem Boden stehen. Das gilt sowohl bezüglich der Verteilung von Kurz- und Langformen als auch bezüglich der Ursprünglichkeit von *šwm* in 12,21 und 14,24. Das aber sind genau die Sachverhalte, die bei den üblichen literarkritischen Analysen und Überlieferungsgeschichtlichen Spekulationen gewöhnlich un diskutiert als feste und sichere Basis unterstellt werden.

4. Erst nach dem textkritischen Durchgang möchte ich auf Beobachtungen zu sprechen kommen, die sich von Anfang an bei einem Blick auf Tabelle I hätten machen lassen: Die Verwendung der Zentralisationsformel und die Verteilung ihrer verschiedenen Gestalten im Text ist nicht einfach quellen- und inhaltsbedingt; hier leiten vielmehr numerische und ästhetische Prinzipien.

Einige Zahlen:

1. Die Zentralisationsformel ist $21 = 3 \times 7$ mal belegt.
2. Da sie in einzelnen Gesetzen mehrfach steht, ergibt sich eine geringere Zahl von "Zentralisationsgesetzen". Es sind genau $14 = 2 \times 7$.
3. Das Verb *škn* ist insgesamt 7 mal belegt.
4. Das Verb *šwm* ist insgesamt 3 mal belegt.
5. Das Element "Stämme" ist insgesamt 2 mal belegt.
6. Alle denkbaren Elemente der Formel treten vereinigt 1 mal auf, und zwar beim ersten Vorkommen der Formel.

Was die Verteilung der Belege angeht, lassen sich folgende Beobachtungen machen:

1. Innerhalb von Kapitel 12 stehen zunächst in einem zusammenhängenden Gesetzeskomplex (eigentliche "Zentralisationsgesetze") 6 Belege der Formel, dann folgen zerstreut weitere 4 Belege: zusammen 10. Innerhalb von Kapitel 16 stehen wieder in einem zusammenhängenden Gesetzeskomplex ("Festgesetze") 6 Belege der Formel, dann folgen zerstreut weitere 4 Belege: zusammen

durchgesetzt: für *šwm* "ponere", für *škn* "habitare", und in 14,24 Ergänzung des Fehlenden. Nur haben die Herren nicht aufgepaßt, und in 12,21 ist die Formulierung des heiligen Hieronymus stehen geblieben.

- abermals 10. Der für die Erreichung der Zahl 21 nötige zusätzliche Beleg findet sich in der Anordnung über die Gesetzesverletzung außerhalb des eigentlichen Korpus.
2. Innerhalb der beiden Gesetzeskomplexe von Kapitel 12 und 16, denen offenbar ein besonderes Gewicht zukommt, stehen jeweils 3 Belege der Langform.
 3. In den Belegen der Langform sind die Verben *šwm* und *škn* folgendermaßen verteilt: Zunächst *šwm* + *škn* (12,5), dann — in chiasmischer Entsprechung — einmal *škn* (12,11), einmal *šwm* (12,21), dann dasselbe noch einmal: erst *škn* (14,23), dann *šwm* (14,24). Das alles spielt sich innerhalb der ersten Zehnergruppe von Belegen ab, die also 3 Belege von *šwm* und 3 von *škn* aufweist. In der zweiten Zehnergruppe von Belegen folgen nur noch Langformen mit *škn*. Es sind 4 Belege, so daß die beiden Verben insgesamt $7 + 3 = 10$ mal vorkommen.

Es wäre die unwahrscheinlichere Hypothese, dies alles als Produkt des Zufalls anzusehen. Hier muß eine ordnende Aktion stattgefunden haben. Ob ihre Absicht rein ästhetischer Natur war (wir müssen hier mit Sensibilitäten rechnen, die uns in unserer Kultur abgehen), ob Hilfen für die genaue Weitergabe des Textes gegeben werden sollten (die spätere Masora hat die Phänomene praktisch nicht registriert⁽³⁵⁾) oder ob sogar zahlensymbolische Mitteilungen gemacht wurden, läßt sich heute kaum noch entscheiden.

Wann fand diese Aktion statt? Das volle System liegt nur in dem der Tabelle I zugrundegelegten protomasoretischen Text vor. Im SP fehlt das Spiel zwischen *šwm* und *škn*, in der LXX sind aus dem ganzen nur die Zahl 14 für die Menge der Zentralisationsgesetze und die Zahl 21 für die Menge der Zentralisationsformeln feststellbar. Lag die Aktion vor dem Auseinandergehen der Textfamilien, etwa bei einer der letzten Deuteronomiumsredaktionen? Dann wären ihre Ergebnisse nur in der Tradition, die zum MT führte, bewahrt worden, in den anderen Traditionen aber mehr oder weniger verlorengegangen. Oder ist sie in Stufen geschehen: nach der Abspaltung des Textes, der zur LXX führte, aber vor der des SP, und dann innerhalb der protomasoretischen Tradition? Oder geschah sie innerhalb

⁽³⁵⁾ Einzige Ausnahme: In 12,5 wurde durch eine Masora Parva das dreifache Vorkommen von *lāšûm* (gegen die Targumim?) geschützt.

der protomasoretischen Tradition allein? Dann wären die samaritanischen Teilübereinstimmungen auf eine Revision des SP nach einer protomasoretischen Vorlage zurückzuführen — was keineswegs ausgeschlossen werden kann. Ich sehe keine Kriterien, die es uns erlauben, zwischen den drei Möglichkeiten zu entscheiden. Zumindest gibt das hier untersuchte Material das nicht her. Vielleicht könnte im Laufe der Zeit eine Entscheidung möglich werden, wenn weitere Textuntersuchungen dieser Art in anderen Problemfeldern des Dtn-Textes auf vergleichbare Phänomene stoßen sollten, die, weil sie außerhalb des (proto)masoretischen Textes fehlen, auf eine relativ späte Textrevision innerhalb der protomasoretischen Textgeschichte weisen.

Doch bei der diese Untersuchung leitenden Fragestellung muß auch gar nicht zwischen den verschiedenen denkbaren Ansätzen der diskutierten textlichen Aktion entschieden werden. Denn welcher auch immer zutreffen sollte, auf jeden Fall gilt, daß irgendwann einmal beschneidend, erweiternd oder umformulierend in einen älteren Bestand an "Zentralisationsformeln" eingegriffen wurde.

Damit entgleitet uns noch stärker als beim textkritischen Vergleich der Zugang zu jenem älteren oder gar "ursprünglichen" Textbestand, den wir als Basis jeder literarkritischen Analyse und Überlieferungsgeschichtlichen Überlegung eigentlich fest in der Hand halten müßten. Es bleibt dabei, daß der MT (in 12,5 minimal emendiert) immer noch die beste Basis für alle weiteren Untersuchungen textkritischer oder Überlieferungsgeschichtlicher Art ist. Aber wir können einfach nicht sicher davon ausgehen, daß jede Zentralisationsformel an ihrer Stelle vor dieser ästhetischen Aktion schon da war, daß sie, wenn sie da war, die Gestalt der jetzt vorliegenden Kurz- oder Langform hatte und daß sie, wenn sie jetzt das Verb *šwm* enthält, dieses auch damals schon besaß. Hat es dann aber überhaupt noch Sinn, hier literarkritisch arbeiten zu wollen? Ein solcher Versuch liefe auf so etwas wie ein Glückspiel hinaus, und überdies auf eines, bei dem die Gewinner niemals bekanntgegeben werden.

5. Die jetzige Verteilung von Kurz- und Langformen der Zentralisationsformel ist so, daß man bei den Belegen der Kurzform die zusätzlichen Teile der Langform stets mitdenken muß (a). Es läßt sich grundsätzlich nicht mehr beweisen, daß dies in einem älteren Stadium des Textes einmal anders gewesen sei (b). Diese beiden Sätze seien im folgenden ein wenig entfaltet.

(a) In Dtn 12 tritt die Kurzform erst beim vierten Vorkommen (12,18) auf (in 12,14 ist sie noch etwas erweitert). Im Gesetz

14,22-17 erscheint sie erst beim dritten Vorkommen. Dann erst findet sich in 15,19-23 ein Gesetz, in dem sofort nur die Kurzform steht. An dieser Stelle ist die ganze Formel aber wohlvertraut.

Auch im zweiten großen Block von Zentralisationsgesetzen, in Dtn 16, steht die Kurzform erst beim dritten Vorkommen. Die beiden bald folgenden Gesetze in 17,8-13 und 18,1-8 können ohne Verwirrung mit der Kurzform auskommen. Die letzte Möglichkeit der Langform (unter Voraussetzung der festliegenden Zahl) wird in dem nun wieder viel weiter entfernten und zum rahmenden Abschluß des Gesetzeskorpus gehörenden Gesetz 26,1-11 eingesetzt. Dtn 31,10-13 greift nur die knappstmögliche Gestalt der Formel auf. Doch als Rückverweis auf die Festgesetze von Dtn 16 ("wenn ganz Israel zusammenkommt") läßt auch dieser Beleg keine Zweifel daran aufkommen, daß er im Sinn der vollen Formel verstanden werden möchte.

(b) Die Frage könnte also höchstens die sein, ob in einer Stufe vor dem in Nr. 4 behandelten textumgestaltenden Eingriff vielleicht einmal eine reine Kurzform in einem Gesetz gestanden hätte, in dem sie nicht durch vorangehende Langformen immer schon als deren verkürzende Wiedergabe hätte verstanden werden müssen.

So glaubt ja, um alles an einem Beispiel zu erörtern, R. P. Merendino aus verschiedenen Gründen das Laubhüttenfestgesetz (in der von ihm rekonstruierten Grundgestalt von 16,16f) als den ältesten im Dtn greifbaren Ort der Zentralisationsformel bestimmen zu können⁽³⁶⁾. Dort steht in 16,5 nur die Kurzform. Damit wäre ihre einst selbständige Existenz, und zwar vorgängig zur Langform, womit Merendino allerdings schon aus allgemeinen Erwägungen rechnet, gesichert. Sie stünde in sich, verwiese nicht auf die allein voll verständliche Langform. Diese wäre ihre sekundäre Erweiterung.

Selbst wenn man die ganze literarkritische Analyse Merendinos übernimmt, läßt sich nach den Beobachtungen von Nr. 4 diese Folgerung nicht mehr ziehen. Denn es ist in einer im Vergleich zu diesen Frühstadien recht späten Periode noch einmal am Text modelliert worden. Wenn jemand behauptet, gerade im Laubhüttengesetz

⁽³⁶⁾ *Gesetz* (siehe Anm. 3) 384. Ich sehe davon ab, daß MERENDINO schwankt, ob er auch noch andere dem Laubhüttenfest zuzuordnende Gesetze als gleichzeitig oder sogar noch älter betrachten soll. Denn er rechnet offenbar mit frei umlaufenden Gesetzen, und stets auch mit der Kurzform.

habe ursprünglich die Langformel gestanden, und erst bei dem späten textmodellierenden Eingriff sei sie hier verkürzt worden, kann man ihn (so wenig er selbst diese Behauptung wird beweisen können) niemals widerlegen. Ähnliches gilt auch von jedem anderen Beleg der Kurzform, an den man analoge Theorien anschließen möchte. Unserer Erkenntnis ist hier eine prinzipielle Schranke gesetzt.

6. Damit bleiben theoretisch nur zwei Beweismöglichkeiten für die These, die Kurzform sei die ursprüngliche und erst in einem zweiten Stadium verlängerte Gestalt der Zentralisationsformel. Man müßte die Kurzform entweder außerhalb des Deuteronomiums durch einen entsprechend früh datierbaren Beleg nachweisen, oder man muß sich mit allgemeinen Überlegungen ohne Textbasis begnügen.

Ein früher außerdeuteronomischer Beleg der Kurzform existiert bekanntlich nicht⁽³⁷⁾. Vielleicht findet sich eines Tages ein Ostrakon

⁽³⁷⁾ PREUSS, *Deuteronomium* (siehe Anm. 3) 14, schreibt zwar: Es "besteht durchaus sogar die Möglichkeit, daß die obengenannte Kultformel vom 'Ort, den Jahwe erwählen wird' ursprünglich nicht nur nicht auf Jerusalem zielte, sondern auch von anderen Heiligtümern in Anspruch genommen wurde (Jos 8,30-35; 9,23.27 Gilgal; Jer 7,12 Silo; vielleicht auch noch Bethel und Gibeon, vgl. 2 Sam 21,6 LXX)". Aber: Jos 8,30-35 enthält die Zentralisationsformel nicht. Der Text ist auf Ex 20,25; Dtn 11,29; 27,2-8.12f zurückzubeziehen. Auch dort steht die Zentralisationsformel nicht. In Jos 9,23 fehlt jede Spur der Zentralisationsformel. In Jos 9,27 befindet sich der einzige Beleg der Kurzform der Zentralisationsformel außerhalb des Dtn. Er wird gewöhnlich als späte, vom Dtn abhängige Glosse betrachtet. Nach meiner Meinung wird durch sie die Aussage des vorangehenden Satzes auf Jerusalem hin orientiert (die Glosse setzt "bis auf diesen Tag" fort). Aber selbst wenn Gilgal gemeint sein sollte, enthält diese Glosse kaum eine Nachricht oder eine Formulierung aus vordeuteronomischer Zeit. Jer 7,12 bietet *māqôm* sowie die Zusatzelemente der Langform, aber gerade nicht das Element *bḥr*, das Charakteristikum der Kurzform. Bezüglich 2 Sam 21,6 ist mir zunächst nicht ersichtlich, wie man den Text auf Betel beziehen kann. Der Text handelt vom "Gibea Sauls" (so MT), was auch die Ur-LXX voraussetzt. Erst später ist in der LXX hier als Ortsname Γαβῶν eingedrungen — aber stets weiter mit dem Namen "Saul" verbunden. Diesen hat J. WELLHAUSEN auf der Ebene der Konjekturekritik gestrichen, weil er "Gibeon" wegen 21,9 für die richtige Lesart hielt und dann natürlich "Saul" nicht gebrauchen konnte. Wenn man dem folgt und dann noch das sonst nur für Personen belegte Wort *bāḥîr* auf das Heiligtum von Gibeon bezieht, könnte man in *bḥîr* JHWH eine Variante der Kurzform der Zentralisationsformel sehen. Aber das ganze ist, sobald man weiß, daß die Ur-LXX noch nicht "Gibeon" las, mehr oder weniger abenteuerlich. Vgl. im Detail D. BARTHÉLEMY, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament, 1. Josué, Juges, Ruth, Samuel, Rois, Chroniques, Es-*

aus der frühen Königszeit, das die Kurzform enthält und auf ein Heiligtum bezieht. Solange das nicht der Fall ist, bleiben nur die allgemeinen Erwägungen.

Diese lassen sich, soweit ich sehe, auf die Formel bringen, gewöhnlich stehe die kürzere Gestalt am Anfang. Daß dies kein ausnahmslos geltendes Prinzip ist, wird jeder zugeben. Zum Beispiel wäre eine bei häufigem Vorkommen einer längeren Formel eingeführte verkürzte Form derselben eine typische Ausnahme. Genau das wird in unserem Fall gegen die Annahme vom höheren Alter der Kurzform behauptet. Letztlich wird man also einfach fragen müssen, welcher der beiden Annahmen die größere Erklärungskraft hinsichtlich des uns bekannten sonstigen Faktenbestands innewohnt. Ich möchte im folgenden auf 4 Tatsachen hinweisen, die sich unter der Voraussetzung, daß die uns bekannte Kurzform am Anfang stand, schwerer erklären lassen als unter der Voraussetzung, daß diese Kurzform wirklich nur eine "Kurzform" der vollen Zentralisationsformel ist.

Die 4 Tatsachen sind:

1. die Verwendung der typischen Langformelemente ohne direkte Unterordnung unter *bḥr* in der dtr Literatur;
2. die Altarformel in Ex 20,24;
3. die Beschränkung des Gebrauchs von *bḥr* für die Erwählung eines Heiligtums allein auf Jerusalem;
4. der Zusammenhang von Dtn 12 mit dem Anfang des Bundesbuchs (Bb).

(1) Während in der deuteronomischen Zentralisationsformel die Verbindung *šwm + šēm JHWH* stets als Infinitiv, der selbst wieder der Erwählungsaussage untergeordnet ist, erscheint, kann diese in der dtr Literatur lockerer der Erwählungsaussage zugeordnet sein, ja ganz ohne sie auftreten⁽³⁸⁾.

Eine Unterordnung wie im Dtn liegt in 1 Kön (8,16); 11,36; 14,21 vor. Dagegen dient die Verbindung in 2 Kön 21,7 der Haupt-

dras, Néhémie, Esther. Rapport final du Comité pour l'analyse textuelle de l'Ancien Testament hébreu (OBO 50/1; Fribourg/Göttingen 1982) 300f. Der *bḥr JHWH* von 2 Sam 21,6 ist Saul, ebenso wie in 1 Sam 10,24 (*'āšer bāḥar bō JHWH*).

⁽³⁸⁾ Zu den folgenden Beobachtungen wurde ich vor allem durch H. WEIPERT, "Ort" (siehe Anm. 1) angeregt.

aussage des Jahwezitats, während die Erwählungsaussage in einem Nebensatz steht, der an eines der beiden Subjekte (Jerusalem) angehängt ist. In 1 Kön 8,44.48 ist die Verbindung nach *bnh* zu *lišmekā* verkürzt. Hier stehen die Aussagen über die Erwählung Jerusalems und die Zuordnung des Tempels zu Jahwes Namen koordiniert nebeneinander (vgl. auch 2 Kön 23,27). In Jer 7,12 schließlich wird von Schilo gesagt: *məqômî ... 'ăšer šikkantî šēmî sām bārî' šônāh*. Die Erwählungsaussage fehlt völlig. Sie kann auch in den Königsbüchern fehlen, wenn es um Jerusalem geht: vgl. 1 Kön 8,29 (und vielleicht auch die längere Entfaltung in 8,41-43).

Aus diesen vielleicht etwas kleinlich erscheinenden syntaktischen Analysen dürfte hervorgehen, daß die dtr Literatur in auf die dt Zentralisationsformeln bezogenen Aussagen die Aussage über den Jahwenamen keineswegs nur als untergeordnete Ergänzung zur Erwählungsaussage empfunden hat, sondern als eigenständiges, unter Umständen sogar allein genügendes Element. In dem einen Fall, wo es nicht um Jerusalem geht, fehlt die Erwählungsaussage, nicht die Namensaussage. Oft wird ja — und sicher zu Recht — angenommen, die dt Zentralisationsformel gehe auf eine kürzere Formel zurück, die nicht nur auf Jerusalem, sondern auch auf andere Heiligtümer anwendbar gewesen sei. Nun, die hier ins Auge gefaßten Tatsachen sprächen eher dafür, daß diese Vorform der dt Zentralisationsformel eine Aussage über die Präsenz des Jahwenamens enthielt, nicht über die Erwählung des Ortes. Das Element der Erwählung würde die Formel vielmehr auf Jerusalem zuspitzen.

Natürlich ist dies alles nur eine Analyse des dtr Sprachempfindens. Nun müssen zunächst noch weitere Fakten herangezogen werden.

(2) Im Altargesetz des Bb findet sich die Abfolge: *māqôm + 'ăšer + Aussage mit šēm JHWH* (20,24). Das Verb dieser "Altarformel" des Bb ist ein anderes als in den bisher betrachteten dt/dtr Formeln: *zkr* Hifil. Aber auch bei den bisher betrachteten Beispielen war nur das Element *šēm* wirklich stabil, und das Verbum konnte variieren oder ganz fehlen.

Auch die Altarformel des Bb grenzt die Möglichkeiten des Kultes zunächst einmal ein (was manchmal übersehen wird). Nicht überall darf Jahwekult geschehen, sondern nur an Orten mit einer bestimmten Qualität. Diese Einschränkung impliziert allerdings nicht, daß der Jahwekult nur an einer einzigen Stätte erlaubt wäre. Vielmehr wird mit einer Vielzahl legitimer Jahwestätten gerechnet: *bēkol*

hammāqôm. An dieser Stelle beginnt aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach sogar die Spitze des Altargesetzes des Bb gegen den zur Zeit der Abfassung gerade errichteten Jerusalemer Tempel mit seiner offenbar schon damals beginnenden Dynamik auf eine Konzentration von möglichst viel Jahwekult bei sich selbst. In 20,25 tritt diese Absicht noch offener zutage: denn der Jerusalemer Altar war nicht mehr aus unbehauenen Steinen⁽³⁹⁾.

Setzt man diese "Frontstellung" des Altargesetzes des Bb voraus, dann gehört die dt Zentralisationsformel auf die gegnerische Seite. Sie zielt ja gerade auf das, was die Kultformel des Bb bekämpft⁽⁴⁰⁾.

Allerdings: Die beiden Formeln haben auch wieder so viel Gemeinsamkeiten, daß man an die oft zu beobachtende Erscheinung erinnert wird, daß Gegner breite Gemeinsamkeiten haben und, um sich voneinander besser absetzen zu können, sich gegenseitig die Sprache stehlen und sie dann jeweils zu ihren eigenen Gunsten wenden. Da zwischen Bb und Dtn Jahrhunderte liegen, müßte ein solcher Vorgang in diesem Fall einseitig sein: das Deuteronomium hätte die Altarformel des Bb zu seinen Gunsten abgewandelt. G. von Rad hat das "eine, wenn auch vielleicht schroffe, Neuinterpretation einer alten Kultordnung" genannt. Ihm erschien die dtn Zentralisationsformel "eigentlich nur wie eine Neufassung" der Altarformel des Bb⁽⁴¹⁾. Das scheint, um hier auf der rein sprachlichen Ebene zu bleiben, in der Tat denkbar.

Ein Relativsatz hat gegenüber dem Nomen, das er bestimmt, attributiven Charakter. Tritt zu einer vorhandenen attributiven Bestimmung eine zweite hinzu, so ist es in der hebräischen Oberflächenstruktur der Sprache durchaus möglich, daß die neue Aussage sich in den Relativsatz setzt und die ältere, vorher den Relativsatz allein bestimmende Aussage innerhalb des Relativsatzes in eine lok-

⁽³⁹⁾ Hierzu vgl. jetzt vor allem J. HALBE, *Das Privilegrecht Jahwes Ex 34,10-26*, Gestalt und Wesen, Herkunft und Wirken in vordeuteronomischer Zeit (FRLANT 114; Göttingen 1975) 369-383.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Das Wort "Frontstellung" stammt von G. VON RAD, *Das fünfte Buch Mose* (siehe Anm. 13) 64. Er sieht allerdings in der Namenstheologie eine Frontstellung gegen "populäre Vorstellungen von der Anwesenheit Jahwes am Kultort", die nach ihm offenbar auch in der Altarformel des Bb ausgesprochen sind. Das ist mir von dessen Formulierung her nicht einleuchtend.

⁽⁴¹⁾ L.c. 65.

ker angeschlossene Infinitivkonstruktion (mit syntaktischer Abhängigkeit zweiten Grades) weiterwandert. Es ist syntaktisch keineswegs zwingend, daß Erweiterungen immer am Ende angehängt werden. Daher ist es — wenn wir im Augenblick die Frage des ausgetauschten Verbs zurückstellen — sprachlich völlig unbedenklich, die Altarformel des Bb als die wahre und ältere "Kurzform" zu betrachten, aus der die Langform der dt Zentralisationsformel entwickelt wurde, und erst aus dieser wäre dann durch Verkürzung die im Dtn vorfindbare "Kurzform" entstanden. Das sei an dieser Stelle nur als reine Möglichkeit hingestellt.

(3) Die Frage, die sich nun stellt, lautet: War denn die Aussage über die "Erwählung" (*bhr*) eines Ortes geeignet, die Altarformel des Bb (zusammen mit der Streichung des *kol*) zu einer Aussage über Jerusalem, und zwar über Jerusalem allein zu machen?

Zunächst muß nüchtern festgestellt werden, daß wir keinen einzigen mit Sicherheit vordeuteronomisch datierbaren Text haben, der von Jahwes Erwählung eines Ortes oder eines Heiligtums spricht, weder einen mit *bhr* noch einen mit einem anderen Ausdruck aus dem Wortfeld der Erwählung⁽⁴²⁾. Gründe für vorexilische, ja sogar vordeuteronomische Herkunft lassen sich für Ps 78 und 132 beibringen. Doch beide Psalmen handeln von der Erwählung des Zion⁽⁴³⁾.

⁽⁴²⁾ Vgl. jetzt die umfassende Untersuchung von J. GUILLÉN TORRALBA, *La fuerza oculta de Dios, La Elección en el Antiguo Testamento* (Institución San Jerónimo, 15; Valencia-Córdoba 1983). Dort die ältere Literatur.

⁽⁴³⁾ Der Zeitansatz beider Psalmen ist umstritten, und zur Zeit überwiegen die Vertreter von Spätansetzungen. Übersichten bieten für Ps 78 A. F. CAMPBELL, "Psalm 78: A Contribution to the Theology of Tenth Century Israel", *CBQ* 41 (1979) 51-79 (51f), und für Ps 132 T. N. D. METTINGER, *King and Messiah: The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings* (ConB, OT 8; Lund 1976) 256, Anm. 256; hinzuzufügen ist noch: T. VEIJOLA, *Verheißung in der Krise: Studien zur Literatur und Theologie der Exilszeit anhand des 89. Psalms* (AASF, B, 220; Helsinki 1982) 72-75 ("jüngerer Dichter", auf "dtr Mutterboden"). Mir scheint die Datierungsfrage trotz der augenblicklichen Spätdatierungstendenz weiterhin offen zu sein, da insbesondere bei jüngsten Arbeiten oft schon ganz bestimmte Auffassungen von der dtr Literatur vorausgesetzt werden, über die man streiten kann. Da ich darauf aber in dieser Untersuchung nicht eingehen will, werde ich, wenn ich die beiden Psalmen weiter unten in meine Argumentation hineinziehe, vorher eine Alternativargumentation entwickeln, die für die dort behandelte Sache auch ohne die beiden Psalmen auskommt. Hier ist dies nicht notwendig, da die beiden Psalmen auf jeden Fall nur von der Erwählung des Zion handeln, nicht von der anderer Heiligtümer.

Faßt man sogar die Gesamtheit der Erwählungsaussagen über Orte und Heiligtümer ins Auge, dann läßt sich schlicht feststellen: Diese Aussagen beziehen sich immer auf Zion/Jerusalem, niemals auf ein anderes Heiligtum oder einen anderen Ort. Man sollte daher zumindest bis zum Auftauchen entgegenlaufender inschriftlicher Zeugnisse davon ausgehen, daß die Erwählungsaussage in Israel nie für ein anderes Heiligtum oder einen anderen Ort als für den Zion üblich war. M. Rose hat versucht, diesen Sachverhalt vom Akkadischen her zu unterlaufen, doch kaum mit Erfolg⁽⁴⁴⁾.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ Zumindest scheint mir seine Anm. 3 in *Ausschließlichkeitsanspruch* (siehe Anm. 4) 84 von dieser Absicht geleitet zu sein. Zu seinen Argumenten: (1) Er sagt, es gebe im Akkadischen "die Wendung vom 'erwählten Ort' (wobei im Adjektiv etymologische Verwandtschaft mit hebr. *bhr* besteht)". Vermutlich meint er die Wendung *ašrī be-ru-ti* KAH 2, 60:100; 61:48, die W. VON SODEN, *AHw* I, unter *bē/iru* II "ausgewählt" zitiert, allerdings auf ausgewählte "Bauplätze" deutet. E. WEIDNER, *Die Inschriften Tukulti-Ninurtas I.* (AfO.B 12; Graz 1959), war in der Übersetzung von *bēru* noch unsicher. *huršāni bēru*ti in Nr. 17:31 (S. 30) übersetzte er, mit Kursivdruck: "die gewaltigen Hochländer", wenn auch der Kursivdruck, der die Unsicherheit der Übersetzung anzeigt, dann bei Nr. 17:48 (S. 31) *ašrī bēru*ti, als "gewaltige Baustellen" wiedergegeben, fehlt (vgl. schon Nr. 16:100 auf S. 28). W. G. LAMBERT, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature* (Oxford 1960) 316, argumentierte von der Verwendung von *bēru* für Bäume her, daß das Wort, wenn auf Berge, Regionen oder Bäume bezogen, mit "vast, extensive, enormous" wiederzugeben sei. Ungefähr 1960 ist auch die Deutung "ausgewählte Bauplätze" durch W. VON SODEN anzusetzen. Allen diesen Autoren fehlten noch die lexikographischen Texte, die im *CAD* 2, 207, referiert werden und *bēru* mit *rūqu*, *bēšu* und sum. *hal*, *bar* identifizieren. Von ihnen her und wegen des parallelen Gebrauchs von *huršāni b.* und *ašrī b.* im gleichen Text kommt das *CAD* an beiden Stellen zur Übersetzung "distant". *ašrī* übersetzt das *CAD* hier mit "regions". Das dürfte VON SODENS "Baustellen" vom Kontext her vorzuziehen sein. Von einem "ausgewählten Ort" im Rahmen von Tempelideologie kann auf keinen Fall die Rede sein. (2) ROSE sagt dann, die Belege seien "zahlreich" dafür, daß "eine Gottheit eine Kultstätte begehrt (o.ä.)". Dafür wird auf *CAD* 4, *erēšu*, verwiesen. Sehr zahlreiche Belege finden sich dort nicht, doch ließen sie sich leicht vermehren. Aber handelt es sich hier um den gesuchten Sinn? Es geht um die Gottheit, die begehrt, ja fordert, daß ihr ein Tempel, eine Priesterin, eine Dienstleistung erstellt, gestiftet, zur Verfügung gestellt werde. Die Idee der Auswahl eines Ortes unter verschiedenen wäre wohl auch eher durch *nasāqu* ausgedrückt worden, doch da fehlen derartige Belege. Ein dem Sinn von *erēšu* entsprechender Wunsch Jahwes, an einem bestimmten Ort ein Heiligtum gegründet zu bekommen, läßt sich mit dem Verb *bhr* im Alten Testament, wenn überhaupt, wiederum nur für Jerusalem nachweisen (vgl. unten zu Ps 132). (3) Schließlich führt bei Rose ein

Selbst wenn man nun annimmt, daß erst das Dtn den Gedanken der Erwählung eines Heiligtums eingeführt habe, müßte man folgern, daß damit im konkreten Kontext der Promulgation des Gesetzbuches in Jerusalem durchaus eine Spezifizierung der älteren Namensausage auf den einen Ort Jerusalem zum Ausdruck gebracht werden konnte – einfach durch die Neuheit des Elements *bhr*. Die Hörer und Leser verstanden, was gemeint war, vor allem auch im Lichte der traditionellen Aussage über die Erwählung der Davididen.

Doch diese Annahme ist die unwahrscheinlichere. Dafür, daß schon vorher in Jerusalem neben der Erwählung der Davididen auch die Erwählung des Zion zur kultischen Tradition gehörten, sprechen 1. die beiden Psalmen 132 und 78, 2. die höchst knapp-stereotype Verwendung der *bhr*-Aussage in der dt Zentralisationsformel, die den Eindruck erweckt, man spiele auf Bekanntes und klar zu Beziehendes an⁽⁴⁵⁾.

etwas vager Hinweis auf H. WILDBERGER, *THAT* I, 286f, den geduldigen Leser zu H. WILDBERGER, "Die Neuinterpretation des Erwählungsglaubens Israels in der Krise der Exilszeit, Überlegungen zum Gebrauch von *bāhar*", *Wort - Gebot - Glauben* (FS. W. Eichrodt; hrsg. v. H. J. STOEBE; ATANT 59; Zürich 1970) 307-324, speziell 309, Anm. 9. Dort werden vier entfernt und indirekt einschlägige Aussagen über mesopotamische Tempel zitiert. W. selbst schließt im Haupttext aus seinem Material: "Der Begriff der Erwählung, wie er in der Verwendung von *bhr* seinen Ausdruck findet, dürfte demnach von Israel mit der 'Königsideologie' (also nicht mit der Tempeltheologie – N.L.) aus seiner Umwelt übernommen worden sein". – Vermutlich läßt sich aus dem mesopotamischen Bereich sogar mehr Material anführen. Doch selbst dann müßte man zögern, es genau da einzutragen, wo uns für Israel die entsprechenden Aussagen fehlen. Es ist dann legitimes Vergleichsmaterial zu den Aussagen über die Erwählung des Zion. – Für entscheidende Hilfe bei der Formulierung dieser Anmerkung danke ich R. I. Caplice, Rom.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ So auch H. WILDBERGER, "Neuinterpretation" (siehe Anm. 44) 312. Für Ps 78 kommt, wenn man ihn nicht aus nachexilischer antisamaritanischer Polemik erklären will, als späteste Entstehungssituation die jüdische Reaktion auf den Untergang des Nordreichs in Frage. Hieran denkt etwa WILDBERGER a.a.O. 314. Ps 132 muß allein schon wegen der im Dtn teils unerwähnten, teils umfunktionierten Lade als vordeuteronomisch vermutet werden. Vorsicht ist hingegen gegenüber der Benutzung des Psalters für die Geschichte der Erwählungstradition bei K. KOCH, "Zur Geschichte der Erwählungsvorstellung in Israel", *ZAW* 67 (1955) 205-226, geboten. Er hält auch die Aussagen über eine Erwählung Israel-Jakobs für vordeuteronomisch, ferner meint er, daß die Traditionen von der Erwählung Jakobs, Davids und des Zion einmal unabhängig voneinander "selbständig mit je eigenem Wortfeld bestanden haben" (213).

Es könnte sogar sein, daß in Ps 132 eine frühe Nuance der Erwählungsaussage für den Zion zum Ausdruck kommt, die sich vom Erwählungsgedanken in Ps 78 und in der dt Zentralisationsformel abheben läßt⁽⁴⁶⁾. Es fehlt nämlich jeder Seitenblick auf andere Orte oder Stätten, die die Benachteiligten der Wahl des Zion sein könnten. Es geht einfach nur darum, daß für die Lade ein *māqôm* (v. 5), eine Ruhestätte (vv. 8.14 vgl. Dtn 12,9) gefunden werden muß: also um die Stiftung eines Heiligtums. Dieses kann nur an dem Ort sein, den Jahwe "wählt", wobei die Nuance von *bhr* durch das zweimal parallel stehende Verbum 'wh "begehren" (das überhaupt nur hier mit Jahwe als Subjekt vorkommt) näher bestimmt wird. Im Sinne dieses Psalms ist in Jerusalem also das Heiligtum, das Jahwe "begehrt" hat. Andere Heiligtümer treten gar nicht in den Gesichtskreis dieser mit Hilfe von *bhr* gemachten Aussage. Wohl aber der mit Jahwe in ein besonderes Verhältnis tretende König, der das Begehren der Gottheit erfüllt. Dieser Gesamtzusammenhang ist zweifellos königsideologisch.

In Ps 78 dagegen ist, so wie in der auf den König bezogenen Erwählungsaussage schon seit den Anfängen, *bhr* ganz im Sinn der Auswahl aus mehreren Möglichkeiten, ja der Ablehnung der anderen Möglichkeit durch Gott gemeint. Die Erwählung ist mit Verwerfung gekoppelt (v. 67). Deshalb ist auch das direkte Objekt von Verwerfung und Erwählung jeweils eine Gruppe innerhalb Israels: einerseits Josef-Efraim, andererseits der Stamm Juda. Erst im Parallelismus dazu steht der Berg Zion, auf dem Jahwe sein kosmisch dimensioniertes Heiligtum gründet (vv. 68f). Und daran schließt sich assoziativ die Erwählung Davids (vv. 70f).

Die dt Zentralisationsformel versteht *bhr* sicher in diesem auswählenden, ja ausschließenden Sinn. Sie abstrahiert von allen geschichtlichen Umständen. Trotzdem knüpft sie hier an.

Zusammen: Es scheint doch eine wirkliche Vorgeschichte der Idee der Erwählung Jerusalems, geknüpft an das Wort *bhr*, gegeben zu haben, während etwas Vergleichbares für andere Orte in Israel nicht existiert zu haben scheint. Die Altarformel des Bb konnte in der Tat durch Streichung von *kol* und Einfügung der Erwählungsaussage auf Jerusalem hin zugespitzt werden.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ Vgl. zur Auslegung von Ps 132 vor allem H. GESE, "Der Davidsbund und die Zionserwählung", *ZAW* 61 (1964) 10-26.

(4) Wenn die Altarformel des Bb von ihrer Struktur her durchaus die Urform der dt Zentralisationsformel und die Erwählungsaussage durchaus das diese Formel auf Jerusalem hin einschränkende Element gewesen sein könnten, erhebt sich die Frage, ob es zusätzliche Sachverhalte gibt, die sich besser erklären lassen, wenn man annimmt, die dt Zentralisationsformel sei aus einer Formulierung am Anfang des Bb heraus entwickelt worden.

Die Tabelle IV gibt einen Überblick über inhaltliche und sprachliche Zusammenhänge zwischen drei Textkomplexen: Dtn 12-26, Ex

TABELLE IV.

Die dt Gesetze und ältere Sammlungen

12,2f	Heiligtümerverschönerung	Ex 34,13	Ex 23,24b	(Ex 20,24)
4-28	Ein Zentralheiligtum			
29-31	Kultsitten, "Fälle"	34,12	23,33	
13,2-19	Alleinverehrung Jahwes	34,14	23,24a	20,23
				22,19
				23,13
				22,30
14,2,21a	Heiligkeit und Speise			
21b	Zicklein und Milch	34,26b	23,19	
15,1-11	"Brachjahr"			23,10f
12-18	Sklavenfreilassung			21,2-11
16,1-17	Festkalender	34,18-25	23,14-18	
16,18-20	Richterspiegel			23,2f.6-8
21f	Fremde Kultsymbole			20,24
17,2-7	Abfall zu Sterngöttern			22,19
18,10-12	Zauberei			22,17
19,1-13	Mord / Asylstädte			21,12-14
16-21	Falsche Aussage			23,1
21,18-21	Störrischer Sohn			21,15-17
22,1-3	Gefundenes Gut			23,4
4	Nachbarschaftshilfe			23,5
28f	Schlaf mit Unverlobter			22,15f
23,20f	Zinsverbot			22,24
24,7	Menschenraub			21,16
10-13	Pfandeinbringung			22,25f
17f	Fremde, Witwen, Waise			22,20-23
				23,9
26,1-11	Erstlingsfrüchte	34,26a	23,19a	

34,10-26 und Ex 20,22-23,33⁽⁴⁷⁾. Beim Bb habe ich zwei Spalten angelegt: die erste für die direkten Parallelen zu Ex 34, die zweite für das restliche Material des Bb. Ferner bin ich von einer groben Verteilung des Materials im Dtn ausgegangen:

- I. 12,2-16,17 "Privilegrecht Jahwes"
- II. 16,18-18,22 Ämtergesetze
- III. 19,1-25,19 Straf- und Zivilrecht
- IV. 26,1-15 "Liturgischer Anhang".

Ich setze auch als selbstverständlich voraus, daß Teil IV eine Art Rahmung bilden soll, also auf die kultische Thematik von Teil I, besonders von dessen Anfang, zurückgreift. Eine Analyse dieser Übersicht führt zu mehreren Feststellungen.

(a) Die drei Korpora weisen so viele und dichte Parallelen auf, daß ein Zusammenhang angenommen werden muß. Das geschieht ja auch im allgemeinen.

(b) Die Anordnung der Gesetze ist aber in allen drei Sammlungen verschieden.

(c) Die Abhängigkeit des Dtn von Ex 34 kann nicht nur indirekt über das Bb gelaufen sein. Denn offensichtlich ist — im Gegensatz zum Bb — das ganze Ex 34 entsprechende Material in Teil I (und IV) zusammengebracht. Das setzt voraus, daß es als eigene Größe im Blick war.

(d) Andererseits ist Teil I nicht (unter Ausschluß des Bb) allein von Ex 34 abhängig. Eher ist beides im Blick: Ex 34 und ein Bb, das die Materialien von Ex 34 ebenfalls schon in sich enthält. Das ist bei der üblicherweise angenommenen Entstehungszeit des Dtn ja auch das Naheliegende.

Dies alles gilt natürlich zunächst einmal von Dtn 12-26 in der Endgestalt. Man müßte nun natürlich literarkritisch fragen, ob sich vielleicht ein Frühstadium von Teil I erschließen ließe, in dem die-

⁽⁴⁷⁾ Über einzelnes läßt sich bei einer solchen Tabelle natürlich stets diskutieren. Ich habe eher den Akzent darauf gelegt, daß zwischen verschiedenen Gesetzen Gesamtentsprechungen vorkommen. So habe ich z.B. die punktuelle Erwähnung der Erstlingsfrüchte im Priester Gesetz (Dtn 18,4) nicht notiert, da es für sie im Dtn ein eigenes Gesetz in 26,1-11 gibt. Mir scheint nicht, daß kleine Abwandlungen der Tabelle bei etwas anderen Erstellungsprinzipien an den Folgerungen, die ich im Text ziehe, etwas ändern würden.

ser Teil allein von Ex 34 abhing, und noch nicht vom Bb. Oder auch umgekehrt — aber das scheint mir höchst unwahrscheinlich zu sein. Solchen höchst komplizierten Fragen kann in diesem Zusammenhang nicht nachgegangen werden. Erst recht nicht der dann sich stellenden Frage, in welchem Stadium der rekonstruierten Textentwicklung die Zentralisationsaussage (und damit die Zentralisationsformel) in den Text gekommen sei. Ich möchte deshalb hier nichts behaupten, sondern nur von einer Möglichkeit sprechen, mit der man rechnen muß: Daß in dem Augenblick, in dem die dt Zentralisationsformel geschaffen und in die dt Gesetze eingeführt wurde, nicht nur Ex 34, sondern auch das Bb den Verfassern klar vor Augen stand und daß sie eine dieses aufgreifende, aber zugleich in vielem bewußt abwandelnde Gesetzgebung schaffen wollten⁽⁴⁸⁾.

Bei dieser (von den Fakten der Tabelle IV eigentlich nahegelegten) Annahme wäre es geradezu zwingend, die dt Zentralisationsformel, die sofort am Anfang des dt Gesetzes auftritt, als anlehrende und zugleich umdeutende Weiterführung der Altarformel vom Anfang des Bb zu betrachten.

Aus all dem zeichnet sich nun die Möglichkeit einer Hypothese ab. Nach ihr wäre die dt Zentralisationsformel ohne jedes Zwischenglied eine Weiterentwicklung der Altarformel des als Quelle der neuen Gesetzgebung dienenden Bb. Die Altarformel des Bb war so gebaut, daß sie auf die dt Weise erweitert werden konnte. Das Verbum *bhr* war für ihre Zuspitzung auf Jerusalem geeignet. Das Sprachgefühl der späteren dtr Autoren hinsichtlich der Zentralisationsaussage paßt in einen solchen Zusammenhang. Die im Dtn belegte "Kurzform" der dt Zentralisationsformel dagegen wäre sekundär. Sie müßte als eine Art abgekürzter Referenz auf die stets vorher im Text schon belegte Langform verstanden werden. Das entspräche ihrer Funktion im definitiven Dtn.

Es ging um die Erklärungskraft verschiedener Hypothesenansätze. Der gegenteilige Ansatz, der am Anfang der Geschichte die jetzt im Dtn auffindbare "Kurzform" sieht, scheint mir nicht in der Lage zu sein, die vier hier eingeführten Sachverhalte ebenso leicht zu in-

⁽⁴⁸⁾ Diese Vorstellung steht z.B. im Gegensatz zu der von R. P. MERENDINO (siehe Anm. 36). Er rechnet mit einer Entstehung der Zentralisationsformel in einem mehr oder weniger frei umlaufenden Kultkalender vom Typ von Ex 34 und in anderen in diesen Bereich gehörenden Kultgesetzen.

tegrieren wie die obige Hypothese. Andererseits weisen diese Sachverhalte Beziehungen zur dt Zentralisationsformel auf, müssen also bei einer Hypothese mit ins Auge gefaßt werden. Mir scheint, man kommt dann innerhalb des üblichen Hypothesenansatzes ohne zusätzliche und teilweise komplizierte Hilfsannahmen nicht aus. Viele Autoren gehen nur auf solche Fragen überhaupt nicht ein. Daher scheint mir die hier entworfene Hypothese zumindest bis zum Auftauchen neuer und von ihr nicht integrierbarer Fakten den Vorrang zu verdienen. Sie ist einfacher und erklärungskräftiger.

Man muß dann natürlich darauf verzichten, im Zusammenhang mit der dt Zentralisationsaussage über eine (mündlich verlaufene) "Überlieferungsgeschichte" der Vorstellungen Israels bezüglich der göttlichen Erwählung von Heiligtümern und der Zentralisation des Kultes nachzudenken. Das spekulative Spielbein wird gewissermaßen in Gips gelegt. Die Entstehung des "Deuteronomiums" in ihrer ersten Phase wäre etwas viel Abrupteres und Kalkulierteres: der bewußte Rückgriff über Jahrhunderte hinweg auf schriftlich erhaltene Zeugnisse eines vorstaatlichen Israel — durchaus verbunden mit dem Willen zu eingreifender Neuinterpretation. Aber hat eine solche Annahme wirklich den Charakter eines Verlustes?

Ich habe bisher einen bestimmten Sachverhalt nicht behandelt: den Wechsel der Verba, die durch das Wort *šēm* (JHWH) bestimmt werden. Ich bin davon ausgegangen, daß das Element *šēm* als Identifizierungssignal genügt. Ohne ins einzelne zu gehen, möchte ich wenigstens andeuten, wie sich der Wechsel der Verba erklären ließe. Vermutlich hat die LXX etwas Richtiges geahnt, als sie alles auf den Ausdruck *qr'* (*b'*)*šēm* zurückführte, der für uns vor allem in den Vätererzählungen, aber ebenso auch etwa in Jer 7,10.11.14.30 belegt ist. Er ist eine selbstverständliche sprachliche Vorgabe für die Rede von Kult und Kultstätte. Er könnte als unausgesprochene Leitformulierung im Hintergrund des Bewußtseins gestanden haben und aus aktuellem Anlaß jeweils abgewandelt worden sein. J. Halbe hat Gründe dafür vorgetragen, im *zkr* Hifil von Ex 20,24 eine polemische Übernahme salomonischer Hofterminologie zu sehen⁽⁴⁹⁾. Bei den beiden Verben der dt Langform könnte es sich um einen sprachlichen Reflex der assyrischen Formulierung *šakānu + šumu* han-

⁽⁴⁹⁾ *Privilegrecht* (siehe Anm. 39) 377-380.

deln⁽⁵⁰⁾: *škn* hätte, nicht ohne eine gewisse semantische Gewalt, die Wurzel mitübernommen, *šwm* hätte genauer den Sinn wiedergegeben⁽⁵¹⁾. Die ganze dt Sprache scheint ja um der eigenen Rezeption willen sich an damals prestigebesetzte assyrische Modelle anzulehnen⁽⁵²⁾. Bei dieser Annahme wäre man im übrigen davon befreit, für *škn* + *šēm* mit einer speziellen Jerusalemer Sprachtradition aus der fernen Amarna-Zeit rechnen zu müssen⁽⁵³⁾.

7. Ich habe in diesen Ausführungen bewußt darauf verzichtet, mehr als unbedingt erforderlich auf Fragen der Aussage und der Theologie einzugehen. Mir scheint, man kann auch vorgängig dazu allein durch Analyse der Textüberlieferung und des sprachlichen Befunds schon ziemlich weit kommen. Vielleicht ist es gelungen, doch einige Argumente zugunsten der eingangs gezeichneten Minoritätsmeinung bezüglich der dt Zentralisationsformel zusammenzutragen.

Theologische Hochschule Sankt Georgen
Offenbacher Landstrasse 224
6000 Frankfurt a. M. 70
Bundesrepublik Deutschland

Norbert LOHFINK

⁽⁵⁰⁾ Zu diesem Ausdruck vgl. vor allem: F. R. KRAUS, "Altmesopotamisches Lebensgefühl", *JNES* 19 (1960) 127-131.

⁽⁵¹⁾ Ich denke hier an das Durchschlagen der sprachlichen Muster einer kulturell dominierenden Sprache in anderen Sprachen. So tritt etwa bei uns heute das deutsche Wort "tatsächlich" unter dem Einfluß des englischen "indeed" immer mehr zugunsten von "in der Tat" zurück. Es läßt sich ebenfalls beobachten, wie solche Anglizismen bewußt oder unbewußt als sprachliche Imponiergesten eingesetzt werden.

⁽⁵²⁾ Vgl. N. LOHFINK, *Unsere großen Wörter*, Das Alte Testament zu Themen dieser Jahre (Freiburg 1977) 24-43 ("Theologie als Antwort auf Plausibilitätskrisen in aufkommenden pluralistischen Situationen, erörtert am Beispiel des deuteronomischen Gesetzes").

⁽⁵³⁾ Das hat vor allem R. DE VAUX, "lieu" (siehe Anm. 2) getan. Die auch vor ihm schon immer wieder zitierten Amarna-Belege sind: Knudtzon EA 287,60-63; 288,5-7. Es kommt erschwerend hinzu, daß der Schreiber, der die Amarna-Briefe aus Jerusalem abfaßte, offenbar gar nicht aus Jerusalem stammte: vgl. W. L. MORAN, "The Syrian Scribe of the Jerusalem Amarna Letters", *Unity and Diversity*, Essays in the History, Literature, and Religion of the Ancient Near East (Ed. by H. GOEDICKE - J. J. M. ROBERTS; Baltimore/London 1975) 146-166.

SOMMAIRE

Il reste toujours une question en suspens à propos des différentes tournures de la «formule de centralisation» deuteronomique (forme brève — forme longue; cette dernière avec *šwm* ou avec *škn*. Peut-on les ordonner en fonction de l'histoire de l'évolution du texte (*Überlieferungsgeschichte*) et les rattacher à différentes couches du Deutéronome (*Literarkritik* — critique des sources)? Le travail procède comme suit: critique textuelle (2^{ème} et 3^{ème} parties); découverte d'une répartition tardive de la formule à travers le livre selon des critères qui s'appuient apparemment sur une esthétique des nombres (4^{ème} et 5^{ème} parties); possibilité d'une hypothèse plus simple que les autres et plus apte à expliquer les données: la formule se serait développée à partir de la formule de l'autel d'Ex 20,24 (6^{ème} partie). Les résultats combinés de ces analyses portent à croire que la formule brève est à considérer comme un simple renvoi littéraire à la formule longue qui la précède toujours.

Israelite Personal Names on Pre-Exilic Hebrew Inscriptions

This article contains a list of the Israelite personal names found in Hebrew inscriptional material antedating the exile⁽¹⁾. Publications of this material are scattered widely in various books and journals. Fortunately, however, a number of helpful collections do exist. David Diringer's *Le iscrizioni antico-ebraiche palestinesi*⁽²⁾ treats material discovered prior to its publication in 1934. Sabatino Moscati's *L'epigraphia ebraica antica 1935-1950*⁽³⁾ updates Diringer's work, as do Francesco Vattioni's "I sigilli ebraici" (1969)⁽⁴⁾ and "I sigilli ebraici II" (1971).⁽⁵⁾ Javier Teixidor's "Bulletin d'épigraphie sémitique", appearing since 1967 in *Syria*, provides a survey of current literature. *Inscriptions Reveal*⁽⁶⁾ and *Inscribed Seals*⁽⁷⁾, while not exhaustive collections, contain excellent photographs of some unpublished as well as previously published material. J. C. L. Gibson's *Syrian Semitic Inscriptions*⁽⁸⁾, André Lemaire's *Inscriptions hébraïques*⁽⁹⁾, and Dennis Pardee's *Handbook of Ancient Hebrew Letters*⁽¹⁰⁾, while not containing photographs, are nevertheless a store of useful information.

(¹) This date is, of course, approximate. The Gibeon jar handles, for example, are included even though they can only be dated broadly to the sixth century. And seals are often difficult to date with precision.

(²) *Le iscrizioni antico-ebraiche palestinesi*, Pubblicazioni della R. Università degli studi di Firenze, Facoltà di lettere e filosofia, III serie, Vol. II (Firenze 1934).

(³) *L'epigraphia ebraica antica 1935-1950* (Roma 1951).

(⁴) «I sigilli ebraici», *Bib* 50 (1969) 357-388.

(⁵) «I sigilli ebraici II», *Augustinianum* 11 (1971) 447-454.

(⁶) *Inscriptions Reveal* (Jerusalem ²1973).

(⁷) R. HESTRIN — M. DAYAGI-MENDELS, *Inscribed Seals* (Jerusalem 1979).

(⁸) *Syrian Semitic Inscriptions*. I. Hebrew and Moabite Inscriptions (Oxford 1971).

(⁹) *Inscriptions hébraïques* (Paris 1977).

(¹⁰) *Handbook of Ancient Hebrew Letters* (Chico 1982).

Not unexpectedly the reliability of the readings catalogued in these works varies considerably. Even where a reading seems reliable one can question to which of the national scripts it belongs. A number of seals formerly considered Hebrew, for example, are now known to be Ammonite. Therefore we have generally included in the list below only those names whose readings we have been able to verify through an examination of a photograph. The only exception to this procedure has been for names occurring on seals where one of the names is Yahwistic, where the literature on the seal indicates no doubt concerning the reading, and where the name in question is also attested elsewhere in Classical Hebrew⁽¹¹⁾. Such names have been included even when no photograph could be found and are marked with an asterisk.

Names which occur before or after a break in a fragment are not included unless it is clear that we have the full name or at least enough letters for a reasonable restoration⁽¹²⁾. Partial restorations are accepted, while complete or nearly complete ones are not⁽¹³⁾. The letters appearing on a given seal do not always indicate to which of the national scripts it belongs. Such seals, if found in Palestine, have been considered Hebrew seals. *Because of the various restrictions just mentioned, the list below lacks many of the names catalogued in the works referred to in the first paragraph.* The list is, in short, a conservative one. To have justified each omission would have expanded this work beyond reasonable bounds, so such justifications are not given.

The names are listed according to the order of the Hebrew alphabet. *Matres lectionis* are considered consonants for the purposes of alphabetization. All occurrences of a name are noted, even when some of them refer to the same person⁽¹⁴⁾. Identical sealings are listed separately if they were published separately⁽¹⁵⁾.

References are generally given only to the major collections if an

⁽¹¹⁾ The names *ḥsd'* and *ywyš'* have been listed even though they are not attested in Classical Hebrew. Both names are formed from elements attested in Hebrew names and are formed according to normal patterns.

⁽¹²⁾ *Ḥnn* in Arad ostracon 92, for example, is not listed since the name might easily have been *ḥnnyḥw*.

⁽¹³⁾ *Gdy/w* in Samaria ostracon 6 is listed, while *[gdyw]* in 5 is not.

⁽¹⁴⁾ For example, *'lyšb* in the Arad ostraca.

⁽¹⁵⁾ For example, M 76, 12 and Va 192.

inscription is treated in them and not to the original publication. Information regarding the original publication can easily be found in these major collections. References to Diringer's work are indicated by a D followed by the page number and then the number of the seal. Thus D 229, 69 refers to Diringer, page 229, number 69. The page number given is always that of the beginning of Diringer's treatment of a seal, not to that where the name first appears in his treatment. References to Moscati (M) are given in a similar manner: M 65, 44 refers to Moscati, page 65, number 44. All references to the Arad material are to the official publication of that material, Yohanan Aharoni's *Arad Inscriptions* (A)⁽¹⁶⁾. A 31.5 refers to *Arad Inscriptions*, number 31, line 5. References to Vattioni's "I sigilli ebraici" (Va) and "I sigilli ebraici II" (V) are to numbers given in those respective treatments. The references to *Inscriptions Reveal* (IR) and *Inscribed Seals* (IS) are likewise to the number. For the names on the Samaria ostraca (SO) we follow the readings of Ivan Tracy Kaufman in his unpublished Harvard University dissertation "The Samaria Ostraca: A Study in Ancient Hebrew Palaeography"⁽¹⁷⁾. We have independently examined the photographs published in this work. Other references are self-explanatory⁽¹⁸⁾.

'b'	M 65, 42; Va 160
'bb'l	SO 2.4
'bgyl	D 218, 62; Va 62; V 62
'by	IR 32.2
'byw	1) SO 52.2 2) *D 221, 65; M 69, 65; Va 65; V 65 3) M 56, 15; Va 123; V 123; IS 36
'byhy	A 39.11
'bm's	<i>IEJ</i> 20 (1970), p. 131
'bryhw	<i>ErIs</i> 12 (1975), p. 68 (Hebrew)
'dnyh	*D 235, 75; M 70, 75; Va 75; V 75 ⁽¹⁹⁾

⁽¹⁶⁾ *Arad Inscriptions* (in Hebrew) (Jerusalem 1975); (in English, edited and revised by A. F. RAINEY) (Jerusalem 1981).

⁽¹⁷⁾ "The Samaria Ostraca: A Study in Ancient Hebrew Paleography", Diss. Harvard, 1966.

⁽¹⁸⁾ This collection of Hebrew personal names began as part of a Harvard dissertation directed by Prof. Frank M. Cross, Jr. and completed in 1977. I owe Prof. Cross a tremendous debt of gratitude for his encouragement, advice, and exemplary kindness.

⁽¹⁹⁾ The theophoric ending might be *-yhw* rather than *-yh* on this name. See DIRINGER, *Le iscrizioni*, 236.

'dnyw	SO 42.3 ⁽²⁰⁾
'dn'm	SO 9.2, ⁽²¹⁾ 10.2/3, ⁽²²⁾ 19.4 ⁽²³⁾
'dt'	M 62, 33; Va 152; IR 134; IS 32
'wryhw	A 31.2
'h'	1) SO 51.3 2) M 83, 27; Va 120 ⁽²⁴⁾ 3) M 83, 29 c; Va 121; V 121; IS 15 4) ZDPV 91 (1975), pp. 131-4 ⁽²⁵⁾
'h'b	D 214, 57; M 69, 57; Va 57; V 57
'h'mh	<i>Semitica</i> 26 (1976), p. 48.
'h'mr	M 76, 13 ⁽²⁶⁾
'hz	1) SO 2.5 2) M 59, 21; Va 141; V 141 3) <i>The Objects from Samaria</i> ⁽²⁷⁾ , pp. 20-1 (Sherd 7) (D 309, 39)
'hzy	SO 25.3
'hzyhw	<i>ErIs</i> 12 (1975), p. 71 (Hebrew)
'hyhw	1) Va 246; IS 87 2) IR 138.2 (Ofel Ostrakon) 3) <i>Ramat Raḥel</i> (1959-60) ⁽²⁸⁾ , pp. 15-6; fig. 14, 1; pl. 10, 1 4) Lachish 3.17
'hyw	1) <i>ErIs</i> 8 (1967), p. 4 2) <i>ErIs</i> 12 (1975), p. 70 (Hebrew)

⁽²⁰⁾ Ivan KAUFMAN remarks concerning this name: "In line three Reisner read *mrnyw*. This should now read *'dnyw*. The vertical shaft of the first letter is quite straight and fits an *'alef* better than *mem*. The *'alef* looks reflexed. The second letter has an improbable stance for *reš* but makes a good *dalet*. The descender may be longer than usual but does not appear to be as long as Reisner drew it" (*Samaria Ostraca*, 137-138).

⁽²¹⁾ See KAUFMAN, *Samaria Ostraca*, 135.

⁽²²⁾ KAUFMAN notes: "The L-man can be read *'dn'm* if, as it appears, the scribe made a mistake and wrote two *lameds* and an *'alef* and then erased the second *lamed* and *'alef* to begin the name again. This would result in a faint vertical from the not quite erased *'alef* which is visible beneath a superb *dalet*" (*Samaria Ostraca*, 135).

⁽²³⁾ KAUFMAN remarks: "In line four I prefer to read *'dn'm* because of the shape of the second letter and because a *het* the size of the example in line three would crowd the following *nun*" (*Samaria Ostraca*, 136).

⁽²⁴⁾ The name *'h'* is restored here on the basis of M 83, 29 c. See I. BEN-DOR, "Two Hebrew Seals", *QDAP* 13 (1947) 66-67.

⁽²⁵⁾ The name could be interpreted as *'h'b* but the *bet* is probably best taken as part of *bn*, as it is also interpreted in lines two and three.

⁽²⁶⁾ Diringer preferred the reading *'hsmk*. See DIRINGER, "On Ancient Hebrew Inscriptions Discovered at Tell ed-Duweir (Lachish)-I", *PEQ* 73 (1941) 43. See also his "Notes on Some Jar-Stamps and Seals Discovered at Lachish", *PEQ* 75 (1943) 55. This reading is impossible, however. The third letter does not have the two or three horizontals of the *samek*. The head of the last letter is not clear, but the stance of the stem is inappropriate for a *kap*. The reading *'h'mr*, on the other hand, fits the traces nicely.

⁽²⁷⁾ J. W. CROWFOOT-G. M. CROWFOOT-Kathleen M. KENYON, *The Objects from Samaria*, Samaria-Sebaste, No. 3 (London 1957).

⁽²⁸⁾ Y. AHARONI, *Excavations at Ramat Raḥel: Seasons 1959 and 1960*. (Serie archeologica 2; Rome 1962).

'hyqm	A 31.5
'hm'	SO 32.3, ⁽²⁹⁾ 37.2, 38.2, 39.2
'hmlk	1) SO 22.2/3, 23.2, ⁽³⁰⁾ 24.1, 25.2, 27.2, 28.2, 29.2, 48.2 2) M. 58, 19; Va 139; IR 127; IS 48 3) M 63, 35; Va 154; IS 58 4) M 76, 11; IS 14 5) A 72.2 6) IS 33 7) <i>Semitica</i> 29 (1979), p. 73 8) IS 73
'hqm	1) Va 210, V 210 2) <i>Semitica</i> 29 (1979), p. 74
'y'dh	M 62, 32; Va 151; IS 52
'l'	SO 38.3
'l'mr	M 56, 14; Va 136
'lb'	SO 1.6 ⁽³¹⁾
'lzk	1) *D 200.42; Va 42 2) *D 200.43; Va 43 3) <i>Semitica</i> 29 (1979), p. 75
'ly'r	1) A 21.2 2) <i>Semitica</i> 29 (1979), pp. 73-4
'lyhw	1) <i>BASOR</i> 220 (1975), pp. 63-6 2) <i>Semitica</i> 29 (1979), p. 73
'lyšr	<i>Sēper Šēmû'el Yeivin</i> , ⁽³²⁾ pp. 307-8, no. 6
'lyqm	1) D 126, 9; M 82, 9; Va 108; V 108; IR 22; IS 8 2) Va 242; IS 26 3) IR 23; IS 9 4) IS 91
'lyšb	1) A 1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, 7.1, 8.1, 11.1, 16.2, 17.2, 18.1/2, 24.2, 38.5, 105 (IS 12), 106 (IS 11) 2) <i>Semitica</i> 26 (1976), pp. 51-2
'lyš'	1) SO 1.4, 7 ⁽³³⁾ 2) D 200, 41; M 68, 41; Va 41 3) A 24, 15, 19/20
'lntn	1) M 57, 18; Va 138; V 138 2) Va 189 3) <i>Lachish</i> 3.15 4) A 110.1 (English edition) 5) IS 80
'l'š	<i>ErIs</i> 12 (1975), p. 70 (Hebrew)
'lrm	Va 220, V 220
'lšb	A 107; IS 13
'lšm'	1) D 232, 72; M 70, 72; Va 72; V 72 2) D 256, 100; Va 100 3) Va 244; IS 71; 4) IS 72
'mryhw	1) Va 211; IR 131; IS 75 2) IR 119 3) Gibeon jar handles ⁽³⁴⁾ 14, 15, 16, 17 ⁽³⁵⁾
'nyhw	<i>HUCA</i> 40-41 (1969-1970), pp. 159-169 (Khirbet el-Kôm, Inscription 3.4)

⁽²⁹⁾ Kaufman notes that this ostrakon is illegible now (*Samaria Ostraca*, 143). Reisner's reading is followed.

⁽³⁰⁾ Kaufman notes: "The ostrakon is now illegible but in a few letters I am able to follow Reisner's reading which is presented here" (*Samaria Ostraca*, 142).

⁽³¹⁾ Concerning this ostrakon Kaufman states: "Readings from line five on are impossible and were difficult for Reisner" (*Samaria Ostraca*, 141). Reisner's reading is followed.

⁽³²⁾ N. AVIGAD, "Six Ancient Hebrew Seals" (in Hebrew), in: *Sēper Šēmû'el Yeivin* (Jerusalem 1970) 305-308.

⁽³³⁾ See n. 31 above.

⁽³⁴⁾ J. B. PRITCHARD, *Hebrew Inscriptions and Stamps from Gibeon* (Museum Monographs; Philadelphia 1959).

⁽³⁵⁾ On Pritchard's proposal to read 'mryhw on jar handle 18 see n. 77 below.

'sp	D 168, 7; Va 7; V 7
'ply	Va 245; IS 70
'pšh	SO 31a.2
'prh	1) Va 239; IS 88 2) IS 51
'šhr	SO 13.3 ⁽³⁶⁾
'r'	IS 95
'ryhw	1) Va 207, V 207 2) A 26.1 3) <i>HUCA</i> 40-41 (1969-1970), pp. 159-169 (Khirbet el-Kôm, Inscription 3.1, 2) 4) <i>Sēper Šēmû'el Yeivin</i> , p. 306, no. 2 5) IS 79 6) IS 80
'š'	SO 22.2, 23.2, ⁽³⁷⁾ 24.1, 26.1, 27.1, 28.1/2, 29.1, 37.3, 39.3
'šyh	A 107; IS 13 ⁽³⁸⁾
'šyhw	1) A 17.3 2) A 51.1 3) A 105; IS 12 4) A 106; IS 11 5) <i>Semitica</i> 26 (1976), p. 50
'šn'	1) M 59, 21; Va 141; V 141 2) IS 40
bwzy	D 190, 31; Va 31
bky	D 341, 10 a; M 83, 10 a; IS 16 ⁽³⁹⁾
blgy	1) *M 60, 23; Va 143 2) <i>Sēper Šēmû'el Yeivin</i> , p. 307, no. 5
bnyhw	1) <i>Magnalia Dei</i> ⁽⁴⁰⁾ , pp. 296-297, fig. 12, 3 2) <i>Semitica</i> 26 (1976), pp. 46-47 3) IS 82
bsy	Va 247; V 247; IS 38
b'l'	SO 1.7, ⁽⁴¹⁾ 3.3, 27.3, 28.3, 31 a.3, 31 b.3
b'lzmr	SO 12.2/3 ⁽⁴²⁾
b'lm'ny	SO 27.3
b'l'zkr	SO 37.3
b'r'	SO 45.2, 47.1
bšl	A 49.1
bšm	M 59, 22; Va 142 ⁽⁴³⁾ ; IS 63
bšr	<i>ErIs</i> 12 (1975), p. 68 (Hebrew)

⁽³⁶⁾ Kaufman remarks: "In line three Reisner read as the name of the secondary man *l's'* but the new photograph reads fairly clearly *l'šhr*" (*Samarina Ostraca*, 135). Lemaire prefers to read the second letter of the name as a *š* (*Inscriptions*, 31).

⁽³⁷⁾ See n. 30 above.

⁽³⁸⁾ The *h* is inscribed at the very edge of the seal, leaving no room for a *waw*.

⁽³⁹⁾ Dinger suggested the reading *bkyh*, but the photograph in *Inscribed Seals* confirms the reading *bky*.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ N. Avigad, "New Light on the Na'ar Seals", in: Frank Moore CROSS - Werner E. LEMKE - Patrick D. MILLER, Jr., *Magnalia Dei* (Garden City 1976) 294-300.

⁽⁴¹⁾ See n. 31 above.

⁽⁴²⁾ Lemaire reads this as two names, *b'l* and *zmr* (*Inscriptions*, 31).

⁽⁴³⁾ The letter following the *šade* cannot be a *yod*. It is clearly a *mem*. The only confusion arises from what must be a scratch below the left vertical of the *mem*'s head. This line descends too far for it to be a *lamed*.

bqš	IS 83
brk	1) M 37 (Barley Letter 11.1, 2) ⁽⁴⁴⁾ 2) <i>The Objects from Samaria</i> , pp. 20-1 (Sherd 7) (D 309, 39) ⁽⁴⁵⁾
brkyhw	1) A 108; IS 54 2) <i>IEJ</i> 28 (1978), p. 53
g'lyhw	1) D 127, 10; Va 110; V 110; IR 21; IS 7 2) A 16.5 3) A 39.5
gdd	Gibeon jar handles ⁽⁴⁶⁾ 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 25, 31, 32, 34, 36, 51, 54, 55
gdyhw	<i>Semitica</i> 29 (1979), pp. 71-72
gdyw	SO 2.2, 4.2, 6.2/3, 7.2, 16 a.2, 16 b.2, 17 a.2, 18.2, 30.2, 33.2, 34.2, 35.2, 42.3
gdl	Va 241, V 241
gdlyhw	1) D 256, 100; Va 100 2) M 61, 30; Va 149 3) Va 218 4) Va 240; IR 128; IS 49 5) A 21.1
ghm	A 31.6
glgl	A 49.3
gmlyhw	Va 169
gmr	SO 29.3, ⁽⁴⁷⁾ 50.1
gmryhw	1) A 31.8 2) A 38.3 3) Lachish 1.1
gr'	SO 30.3
gryhw	1) Va 243; IS 62 2) IS 63 ⁽⁴⁸⁾
gr'	SO 1.4 ⁽⁴⁹⁾
dg'	A 31.2 ⁽⁵⁰⁾
ddyhw	<i>ErIs</i> 12 (1975), pp. 66-67 (Hebrew)
dlh	1) SO 38.3 ⁽⁵¹⁾ 2) Va 238; IS 39

⁽⁴⁴⁾ See also *The Objects from Samaria* (n. 27 above) 11-16.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ It is disputed whether this is a personal name or not. See the discussion in *The Objects from Samaria* and the comments of Lemaire (*Inscriptions*, 250).

⁽⁴⁶⁾ On this reading see F. M. CROSS, "Epigraphical Notes on Hebrew Documents of the Eighth-Sixth Centuries B.C: The Inscribed Jar Handles from Gibeon", *BASOR* 168 (1961) 19-20. On the reading and also on its interpretation as a personal name see N. AVIGAD, "Some Notes on the Hebrew Inscriptions from Gibeon (Review Article)", *IEJ* 9 (1959) 130-133.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ Kaufman remarks: "The secondary personal name preceding the place name is difficult but seems more likely (g)mr or (q)mr rather than qdr as Reisner reads it. The mem can have lost its descender" (*Samaria Ostraca*, 137). Lemaire prefers to read 'mr (*Inscriptions*, 33).

⁽⁴⁸⁾ This reading is preferable to that of M 59.22; Va 142.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ Concerning this reading Kaufman states: "In line four, Reisner reads the first name as rg' whereas it is more clearly gr' in the photographs and to the naked eye. The gimel has a slight overhang of the horizontal to the right of the vertical. Reisner's unpublished photograph shows a straight descender precluding any possibility of it being pe" (*Samaria Ostraca*, 134).

⁽⁵⁰⁾ The first letter of this name is a dalet not a reš as in Aharoni. Note that the topstroke extends beyond the downstroke. See n. 78 below.

⁽⁵¹⁾ Reading with Kaufman for Reisner's 'lh.

dltyhw	<i>ErIs</i> 12 (1975), p. 68 (Hebrew)
dml'	1) D 307, 36 ⁽⁵²⁾ 2) Gibeon jar handles 21, 26, 27, 28, 29 3) IS 47
dml'l	Va 233
dmlyhw	1) D 178, 19; Va 19 ⁽⁵³⁾ 2) D 217, 60; Va 60
dršyhw	1) A 109: IS 86 2) <i>ErIs</i> 12 (1975), p. 70 (Hebrew)
hglnyh	M 65, 43; Va 161: IS 67
hwdwyhw	Lachish 3.17
hwdyh	M 63, 36; Va 155; IS 69
hwdyhw	1) <i>Semitica</i> 26 (1976), p. 46 2) <i>Semitica</i> 26 (1976), p. 49
hwžkr	IS 93
hwš'	1) D 204, 46; Va 46; V 46 2) M 75, 10; IS 22 3) Va 181, V 181
	4) IR 32.1 5) IS 78
hwš'yhw	1) M 60, 24; Va 144; IR 132 (and p. 131 of the Hebrew section);
	IS 53 2) IR 33.7 ⁽⁵⁴⁾ (Yabneh-yam) 3) Lachish 3.1 4) IS 72 5) IS 73
hkws	A 38.1
hšlyhw	1) Va 186 2) Lachish 1.1 3) IS 59 4) IS 60
zk'	M 75, 8; Va 107; V 107
zkr	1) SO 31 a.3 2) D 204, 46; M 69, 46; Va 46; V 46 3) D 205, 47;
	M 69, 47; Va 47 4) Va 171 5) <i>ZDPV</i> 91 (1975), pp. 131-4.
zkryhw	*D 261, 104; Va 104; V 104
zkryw	Va 167, V 167
zqn	<i>ErIs</i> 12 (1975), p. 71 (Hebrew)
ḥgb	Lachish 1.3
ḥgy	1) D 179, 20; Va 20 2) Va 203 3) Va 213 4) <i>Magnalia Dei</i> , pp. 296-297, fig. 12, 3
ḥwyhw	<i>Semitica</i> 26 (1976), p. 48
ḥyl'	<i>ErIs</i> 12 (1975), p. 67 (Hebrew) 2) IS 68
ḥldy	A 39.10
ḥlš	SO 22.4, 23.3, 30.2, 31 a.2, 32.2, ⁽⁵⁵⁾ 35.2
ḥlšyhw	Va 176, 2
ḥlq	<i>ErIs</i> 12 (1975), p. 68 (Hebrew)
ḥlqyhw	1) D 209, 52; Va 52; V 52 2) M 62, 31; Va 150; IS 27 3) <i>Sēper</i>

⁽⁵²⁾ The first letter of this name has a strongly slanted stance, a relatively large angular head and a "breakthrough" of the topstroke to the right and is thus clearly a *dalet*, not a *reš*. See n. 78 below.

⁽⁵³⁾ Porten remarks: "Palaeographically, the reading of the name here is not in doubt; the hesitation regarding the initial letter between the *dalet* and the *resh* was due primarily to the existence of the biblical name Remaliah (2 Kings 15:25, etc.) and the inability to provide persuasive etymology for דמליה" (B. PORTEN, "Domla'el and Related Names", *IEJ* 21 (1971) 48, n. 6).

⁽⁵⁴⁾ On this reading see F. M. CROSS, «Epigraphic Notes on Hebrew Documents of the Eighth-Sixth Centuries B.C.: II. The Murabba'at Papyrus and the Letter Found near Yabneh-Yam», *BASOR* 165 (1962) 43, n. 32.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ See n. 29 above.

- Šēmū'el Yeivin*, p. 307, no. 4 4) *ErIs* 12 (1975), pp. 66-67 (Hebrew)
 5) *Semitica* 26 (1976), p. 53 6) IS 55⁽⁵⁶⁾ 7) IS 56 8) IS 57
- ḥmd' A 55.1
 ḥmy'hl IS 34
 ḥmy'dn IS 33
 ḥml *ErIs* 12 (1975), p. 70 (Hebrew)
 ḥmn D 165, 3; M 66, 3; Va 3; IR 126; IS 42
 ḥn' SO 30.3⁽⁵⁷⁾
 ḥnh *PEQ* 108 (1976), pp. 59-61
 ḥnyhw *Semitica* 26 (1976), p. 45
 ḥnn 1) SO 43.2, 45.2, 46.2, 47.1 2) Va 237 3) A 38.6
 ḥnnnyhw 1) D 184, 24; M 67, 24; Va 24; V 24 2) D 185, 25; M 68, 25; Va 25 3) D 207, 50; Va 50; IS 64 4) Va 218, V 218 5) A 3.3 6) A 16.1 7) A 36.4 8) Gibeon jar handles 22, 32, 33, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 47, 50, 51, 52 9) IS 59 10) IS 79 11) *ZDPV* 91 (1975), pp. 131-134
 ḥsd' M 74, 2; IS 25
 ḥsdyhw 1) Va 220; V 220 2) *Ramat Rahel* (1959-1960), pp. 15-16; fig. 14, 1; pl. 10, 1
 ḥsy Va 169
 ḥrp D 196, 37; Va 37; V 37
 ḥts Va 179
 ṭb' *Semitica* 26 (1976), p. 52
 ṭbyhw Lachish 3.19⁽⁵⁸⁾
 ṭbšlm Lachish 1.2
 y'wš Lachish 2.1, 6.1
 y'zn A 59.5
 y'znyh Va 241
 y'znyhw 1) D 229, 69; M 70, 69; Va 69; V 69; IR 19; IS 5 2) A 39.9 3) Lachish 1.2, 3
 y'r *D 261, 104; Va 104; V 104
 ygdlyhw IS 61
 ydlyhw Va 237
 ydneyhw A 27.4
 yd' Lachish 3.20
 yd'yhw 1) A 31.7 2) A 39.4 3) A 39.5 4) *Sēper Šēmū'el Yeivin*, pp. 305-306, no. 1
 yd' yw SO 1.8,⁽⁵⁹⁾ 42.2, 48.1⁽⁶⁰⁾

⁽⁵⁶⁾ The waw at the end of this name is chipped.

⁽⁵⁷⁾ Kaufman remarks: "The second name in line three can be read as ḥn' followed by a word divider rather than *bet*" (*Samaria Ostraca*, 137).

⁽⁵⁸⁾ This reading is definitely preferable to the *ndbyhw* of Torczyner in Harry TORCZYNER – Lankester HARDING – Alkin LEWIS – J. L. STARKEY, *Lachish I: The Lachish Letters* (London 1938) 51.

⁽⁵⁹⁾ See n. 31 above.

⁽⁶⁰⁾ Kaufman follows Reisner's reading of this name in ostracon 48 but notes that it is quite illegible (*Samaria Ostraca*, 143).

yhw'b	1) A 39.10 2) A 59.1
yhw'h _z	Va 252; V 252; IR 20; IS 6
yhw _h yl	*D 200, 42; Va 42
yhw _h l	<i>Ramat Rahel</i> (1959-1960), p. 44; fig. 31, 2; pl. 27, 2; IR 87; IS 20
yhwysm'	Va 226; V 226
yhwkl	1) V 253 2) A 21.1
yhwmlk	M 65, 44; Va 162
yhwndb	IS 92
yhw'z	1) IS 89 2) A 31.3
yhw'zr	IS 61
yhwqm	1) <i>ErIs</i> 12 (1975), p. 69 (Hebrew), no. 12 2) <i>ErIs</i> 12 (1975), p. 69 (Hebrew), no. 13; IS 92
yhwš'	D 187, 27; Va 27
yw'mn	Va 172
yw'r	Va 249
ywb _h nh	Va 197; V 197; IR 89; IS 21
ywznb	<i>Semitica</i> 26 (1976), p. 50
ywyš'	*D 311, 40
ywkn	1) D 126, 9; M 82, 9; Va 108; V 108; IR 22; IS 8 2) IR 23; IS 9
ywn _h tn	SO 45.3 ⁽⁶¹⁾
yw'zr	IR 32.4
yw'šh	Va 171
ywqm	D 197, 38; M 68, 38; Va 38; V 38 ⁽⁶²⁾
y _h w'ly	SO 55.2, 60.1
y _h z'	IR 114
y _h zyhw	IR 103
y _h l'l	<i>HUCA</i> 40-41 (1969-1970), pp. 159-169 (Khirbet el-Kôm, Inscription 3.3) ⁽⁶³⁾
y _h ml	<i>HUCA</i> 40-41 (1969-1970), pp. 169-172 (Khirbet el-Kôm, the Decanter)
y _h mlyhw	1) D 208, 51; M 69, 51; Va 51; V 51 2) <i>ErIs</i> 12 (1975), pp. 69-70 (Hebrew)
y _h š	D 171, 10; M 67, 10; Va 10

(⁶¹) Kaufman states: "In line three I read *ywn_htn* . *mys(t)*. Reisner's addition of *mrn* before *ywn_htn* is unlikely for lack of space (compare lines one and three). If the name is *ywn_htn* there can be no word divider after *yw*. The downstroke of the head of the *waw* could account for the mark which Reisner read as a word divider. A further argument against having a word divider is lack of space for it" (*Samaria Ostraca*, 138).

(⁶²) There is a photograph of this inscription, but it is not completely clear. See Stanley A. Cook, *The Religion of Ancient Palestine in the Light of Archaeology* (London 1930), pl. 9, figs. 25-27.

(⁶³) This reading is preferable to that given in *HUCA* (*y_hl' l' šr*). Read *šrt* ("his lady") after *y_hl' l'*, as proposed by F. M. Cross.

ymnh	M 37 (Barley Letter 1.3) ⁽⁶⁴⁾
y's	SO 48.3
yqmyh	M 63, 34; Va 153, 1; V 153; IS 84 ⁽⁶⁵⁾
yqmyhw	1) *D 210, 53; Va 53 ⁽⁶⁶⁾ 2) M 54, 8; Va 122 ⁽⁶⁷⁾ ; IS 44 3) A 39.1 4) A 24.15/16 ⁽⁶⁸⁾ 5) A 59.2 6) <i>BASOR</i> 220 (1975), pp. 63-66 7) <i>Semitica</i> 26 (1976), p. 48
yr'wyhw	IS 95
yrb'm	D 224, 68; M 70, 68; Va 68; V 68; IR 18; IS 3
yrhm'l	<i>IEJ</i> 28 (1978), pp. 53-54
yrymw	<i>Semitica</i> 26 (1976), pp. 46-47
yrymyhw	1) *D 215, 58; Va 58; V 58; 2) M 74, 2; IS 25 3) Va 248; IR 129; IS 45 4) V 258 5) Lachish 1.4 6) <i>Semitica</i> 26 (1976), pp. 47-48 7) <i>Semitica</i> 29 (1979), pp. 73-74
yš'l	Va 213
yšb	*D 193, 34; Va 34
yšm'l	1) *D 210, 53; Va 53 ⁽⁶⁹⁾ 2) <i>RB</i> 77 (1970), pp. 59-67 3) <i>IEJ</i> 27 (1977), pp. 197-199 4) IS 77
yš''	IS 74
yš'yh	<i>IEJ</i> 23 (1973), pp. 236-237
yš'yhw	1) *D 209, 52; Va 52 2) Va 211; IR 131; IS 75 3) IS 60 4) IS 76
yšpt	A 53
ytm	1) M 54, 9; Va 131; V 131 2) <i>Semitica</i> 29 (1979), p. 75
klkly	IS 93
ks'	M 75, 8; Va 107; V 107
kršn	IR 32.3
kšy	<i>Sēper Šēmū'el Yeivin</i> , pp. 305-306, no. 1
l'ryw	SO 50.2 ⁽⁷⁰⁾

⁽⁶⁴⁾ We take *ymnh* as a personal name, following the interpretation of Albright. See W. F. ALBRIGHT, "Ostrakon C 1101 of Samaria", *PEQ* 68 (1936) 212-213.

⁽⁶⁵⁾ This name is given in Moscati, following Reifenberg, as *šqnyh*, but Moscati expresses his doubts about the reading. The photograph in IS allows the more reliable reading given here.

⁽⁶⁶⁾ The Va reference to *EB* III, 80, tav. 3 is incorrect. This reference belongs to Va 122. The correct reference for the present name is *EB* III, 764.

⁽⁶⁷⁾ See n. 66 above.

⁽⁶⁸⁾ This reading is preferable to the *yrymyhw* of Aharoni. There is a semi-circle evident on the right as well as on the left of the second letter of the name.

⁽⁶⁹⁾ See n. 66 above.

⁽⁷⁰⁾ Yadin ("Recipients or Owners, a Note on the Samaria Ostraca", *IEJ* 9 [1959] 185) includes ostrakon 50 among those having two L-men, but, since the *lamed* precedes the second secondary name, Kaufman does not follow this interpretation. He prefers to read the *lamed* as part of the name

lhš	Va 251
m's	1) M 62, 31; Va 150; Is 27 ⁽⁷¹⁾ 2) <i>Semitica</i> 29 (1979) pp. 74-75
m'sš	<i>Syria</i> 52 (1975), pp. 107-118
mbṭhyhw	Lachish 1.4
mbn	Va 206; V 206
mgn	1) M 76, 12 2) Va 192 3) <i>Ramat Raḥel</i> (1961-1962), p. 32; fig. 37, 5; pl. 40, 5
my'mn	IS 94
mykyhw	D 190, 30 ⁽⁷²⁾
mk'	<i>IEJ</i> 25 (1975), pp. 101-105
mky	1) A 110.2 (English edition) 2) M 63, 34; Va 153, 1; V 153; IS 84
mkyhw	<i>Semitica</i> 26 (1976), p. 49
mlkyhw	1) Va 176 2) A 24.14 3) A 39.2 4) A 40.3 5) <i>Magnalia Dei</i> , pp. 295-296; fig. 12, 2 6) <i>Semitica</i> 29 (1979), p. 72 7) IS 68
mlkrm	Va 250
mnḥ	<i>Syria</i> 52 (1975), pp. 107-118
mnḥm	1) Va 197; V 197; IR 89; IS 21 2) <i>Semitica</i> 26 (1976), pp. 47-48 3) IS 34 4) IS 78
m'dnh	<i>IEJ</i> 28 (1978), p. 146-151
m'sy	A 22.4
m'syh	1) Va 242; IS 26 2) <i>IEJ</i> 23 (1973), pp. 236-237 ⁽⁷³⁾ 3) IS 77
m'syhw	1) D 208, 51; M 69, 51; Va 51; V 51 2) *D 212, 55; Va 55
mḡnyhw	1) M 65, 44; Va 162 2) A 60.4 3) A 72.1 ⁽⁷⁴⁾
mrḇ'l	SO 2.7
mrmtwt	A 50
mšlm	1) *D 212, 55; Va 55 2) D 213, 56; Va 56 3) M 76, 11; IS 14 4) Va 189 5) Va 190 6) A 110.1 (English edition)

(*Samaria Ostraca*, 153-154, n. 13). Because of its clearly vertical stance the third letter should be read as *reš* not *bet* (see *Samaria Ostraca*, 139).

⁽⁷¹⁾ J. A. Thompson observes: "The second name is *m's*, as first read by J. L. Starkey, not the *m'ps* of Diringer, who follows a proposal of G. R. Driver, which was also accepted by L. H. Vincent after direct examination of the stamp. The slant of the stroke to the left of the upright of the *aleph* would be very unusual for a *pe*. The head of the supposed *pe*, which Driver and Vincent profess to see running into lowest cross-stroke of the *samekh*, does not appear on the photograph and was not found by E. L. Sukenik, who examined the stamp itself" (J. A. THOMPSON, "On Some Stamps and a Seal from Lachish", *BASOR* 86 [1942] 26).

⁽⁷²⁾ The theophoric element might be *-yh* rather than *-yhw* on this name. The photograph is not completely clear (see COOK, *Religion of Ancient Palestine*, pl. 13. fig. 6)

⁽⁷³⁾ Although there is a horizontal line after the *hš*, this line does not have the form of a *waw*.

⁽⁷⁴⁾ This reading fits the traces more neatly than the *mknyhw* of Aha-roni.

mtn	1) <i>ErIs</i> 15 (1981) p. 303 (Hebrew) 2) <i>Semitica</i> 29 (1979), p. 72
mtnyhw	1) V 268; IR 133; IS 66 2) Lachish 1.5 3) <i>Semitica</i> 26 (1976), p. 49, no. 9 4) <i>Semitica</i> 26 (1976), p. 49, no. 11 5) <i>Semitica</i> 26 (1976), p. 51 6) <i>IEJ</i> 27 (1977), pp. 197-199
mttyhw	<i>IEJ</i> 30 (1980), pp. 170-173
nby	1) V 258 2) <i>ErIs</i> 15 (1981), p. 305 (Hebrew)
ngb	1) M 75, 7 2) Va 187
nhm	1) D 124, 7; IR 90; IS 17 2) M 77, 14 3) Va 186 4) Va 244; IS 71 5) V 254 6) A 16.10 7) A 17.1, 8 8) <i>Semitica</i> 26 (1976), p. 51
nhmyhw	1) D 190, 30 ⁽⁷⁵⁾ 2) A 31.3 3) A 40.1/2
nqm	<i>RB</i> 77 (1970), pp. 50-59 ⁽⁷⁶⁾
nr'	1) Gibeon jar handles 22, 24, 32, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50 2) <i>BASOR</i> 213 (1974), pp. 46-48 3) IR 85; IS 18
nry	M 53, 4; Va 127
nryhw	1) D 178, 19; Va 19; V 19 2) D 207, 50; Va 50; IS 64 3) D 213, 56; Va 56 4) V 255 5) A 31.4 6) IR 119 7) Gibeon jar handle 18 ⁽⁷⁷⁾ 8) Lachish 1.5 9) <i>Semitica</i> 26 (1976), p. 46 10) <i>IEJ</i> 28 (1978), p. 53 11) <i>IEJ</i> 28 (1978), p. 56 12) IS 65
ntbyhw	<i>ErIs</i> 15 (1981), p. 303 (Hebrew)
ntn	<i>Semitica</i> 29 (1979), pp. 74-75
ntnyhw	1) D 190, 31; Va 31 2) *D 191, 32; M 68, 32; Va 32 3) <i>HUCA</i> 40-41 (1969-1970), a) pp. 151-156, b) pp. 156-158 (Khirbet el-Kôm, a) Inscription 1.2, b) Inscription 2)
syl'	M 63, 36; Va 155; IS 69
smk	1) M 58, 19; Va 139; IR 127; IS 48 2) M 74, 6 3) Va 240; IR 128; IS 49 4) <i>Sēper Šēmū'el Yeivin</i> , p. 307, no. 5 5) IS 83
smkyhw	1) Va 239; IS 88 2) Lachish 4.6, 11.5
s'dyhw	A 31.4 ⁽⁷⁸⁾
strh	D 173, 12; Va 12
'bd' yw	SO 57.1 ⁽⁷⁹⁾

⁽⁷⁵⁾ See n. 72 above.

⁽⁷⁶⁾ On the interpretation of *nqm* as a personal name, see J. PRIGNAUD, "Notes d'épigraphie hébraïque", *RB* 77 (1970) 58, n. 31.

⁽⁷⁷⁾ Reading with Avigad for Pritchard's proposed reconstruction 'mryhw. See AVIGAD, *IEJ* 9, 130-133.

⁽⁷⁸⁾ This reading is preferable to the *s'ryhw* of Aharoni. The topstroke of the third letter extends beyond the vertical downstroke, a characteristic of *dalet* in this period. The length of the leg is not a critically distinguishing characteristic in this period. Cf. the *dalet* in A 18.1. On *dalet* and *resh* in the eighth-sixth centuries see Cross, *BASOR* 168, 19.

⁽⁷⁹⁾ Kaufman remarks concerning this reading: "In line one Reisner read 'bd' . yw. It seems certain that the supposed word divider is the reflex of the *yod* and that the name is properly 'bd' yw" (*Samaria Ostraca*, 139). The

'bdy	1) D 124, 7; IR 90; IS 17 2) M 77, 14 3) M 77, 15 4) Va 172
'bdyhw	1) *D 191, 32; M 68, 32; Va 32 2) *D 193, 34; Va 34 ⁽⁸⁰⁾ 3) D 194, 35; Va 35 4) *D 230, 70; Va 70; V 70 5) A 10.4 6) IS 74
'bdyw	1) SO 50.2 2) Kuntillet 'Ajrud 10 ⁽⁸¹⁾
'dyhw	1) *M 61, 28; Va 148 2) M 63, 35; Va 154; IS 58 3) A 58.1 4) <i>Semitica</i> 26 (1976), pp. 50-51 5) IS 56
'dnh	Kuntillet 'Ajrud 10 ⁽⁸²⁾
'wpy	<i>HUCA</i> 40-41 (1969-1970), a) pp. 151-156, b) pp. 156-158 (Khirbet el-Kôm, a) Inscription 1.1, b) Inscription 2) ⁽⁸³⁾
'z'	1) SO 1.5 ⁽⁸⁴⁾ 2) D 308, 37 3) Va 179 4) Va 205 5) IS 91
'zyhw	1) D 196, 37; Va 37; V 37 2) IS 65
'zyw	*D 221, 65; M 69, 65; Va 65; V 65
'zr	1) D 205, 47; M 69, 47; Va 47 2) A 51.2 3) A 58.3 4) <i>ErIs</i> 12 (1975), p. 70 (Hebrew) 5) <i>Semitica</i> 26 (1976), p. 49 6) <i>Semitica</i> 26 (1976), p. 50 7) <i>ZDPV</i> 91 (1975), pp. 131-134
'zryhw	1) D 122, 5 a; IS 24 ⁽⁸⁵⁾ 2) D 184, 24; M 67, 24; Va 24; V 24 3) *D 199, 40; M 68, 40; Va 40; V 40 4) M 73, 1; IR 88; IS 23 5) Va 207; V 207 6) V 268; IR 133; IS 66 7) Gibeon jar handles 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 8) <i>Sēper Šēmū'el Yeivin</i> , p. 307, no. 4 9) <i>Semitica</i> 26 (1976), p. 47
'zryw	Va 228; V 228
'kbr	1) D 185, 25; M 68, 25; Va 25 2) Va 210
'mdyhw	D 218, 61; M 69, 61; Va 61
'mšlm	A 59.4
'nmš	SO 24.2
'nnyhw	V 254
'rb	<i>ErIs</i> 15 (1981), p. 305 (Hebrew)
'šy	Va 243; IS 62
'šyhw	1) D 187, 27; Va 27 2) *D 218, 62; Va 62; V 62 3) M 56, 16; Va 109; IR 125; IS 50 4) <i>Semitica</i> 26 (1976), p. 48
'šyw	D 197, 38; M 68, 38; Va 38; V 38 ⁽⁸⁶⁾
'šn'l	D 244, 88; M 71, 88; Va 88
pdh	Va 236

photograph in Kaufman's dissertation shows that the last letter is clearly a waw and not a nun as in DIRINGER, *Le iscrizioni*, 35.

⁽⁸⁰⁾ The theophoric ending might be *-yh* rather than *-yhw* on this name. See DIRINGER, *Le iscrizioni*, 193.

⁽⁸¹⁾ Z. MESHEL, *Kuntillet 'Ajrud: A Religious Centre from the Time of the Judaeon Monarchy on the Border of Sinai* (Jerusalem 1978).

⁽⁸²⁾ Meshel, *Kuntillet 'Ajrud*.

⁽⁸³⁾ The reading 'wpy in Inscription 2 is virtually certain.

⁽⁸⁴⁾ See n. 31 above.

⁽⁸⁵⁾ The 'ayin in this name is restored.

⁽⁸⁶⁾ See n. 62 above.

pd _y	<i>Semitica</i> 26 (1976), p. 52
pd _y hw	1) Va 235 2) A 49.15 3) <i>Semitica</i> 26 (1976), p. 47
pd _y w	SO 58.1 ⁽⁸⁷⁾
pṭ's	M 55, 12; Va 134; IS 41
pṭ _y hw	IR 115
pl'yhw	<i>IEJ</i> 30 (1980), pp. 170-173
plṭ _y hw	1) <i>Semitica</i> 26 (1976), p. 53 2) <i>Semitica</i> 29 (1979) p. 74
psh	Va 235
ppy	A 72.2
pqh	1) IR 109 2) Lachish 19.2 (<i>PEQ</i> 75 [1943], pp. 89 ff.)
pšhr	1) *M 61, 28; Va 148 2) M 62, 33; Va 152; IR 134; IS 32 3) A 54
pšyd	A 52 ⁽⁸⁸⁾
šbly	IS 82
šdq	1) M 74, 6 2) A 93 3) <i>IEJ</i> 25 (1975), pp. 101-105
šmh	A 49.11
špn	1) M 73, 1; IR 88; IS 23 2) M 75, 10; IS 22 3) <i>Semitica</i> 26 (1976), 46 4) IS 90 5) <i>IEJ</i> 20 (1970), p. 131
špn _y hw	1) D 198, 39; Va 39; V 39 2) V 258
qlyhw	Va 233
qlyw	<i>The Objects from Samaria</i> , pp. 17-18; pl. I, 1
qnyw	D 174, 13; M 67, 13; Va 13; V 13 ⁽⁸⁹⁾
qrb'wr	A 24.14 ⁽⁹⁰⁾
qrwh	IR 138.1 (Ofel Ostrakon)
qrḥ	A 49.2
qry	IR 138.3 (Ofel Ostrakon) ⁽⁹¹⁾
rbyhw	M 65, 43; Va 161; IS 67
rm'	D 174, 14; Va 14
rp'	1) SO 24.2 2) <i>Semitica</i> 26 (1976), p. 52

⁽⁸⁷⁾ Kaufman remarks: "In line one Reisner read the personal name *b_dyw*. Comparing the second letter of the name with the clear *bet* at the beginning of line one, I am inclined to read *p_dyw*. There is a horizontal stroke in evidence which does not seem proper for the top stroke of *bet* nor for the lower stroke of the head of *bet* because of the length of tail below" (*Samaria Ostraca*, 139).

⁽⁸⁸⁾ Lemaire's proposed reading *šyd* (*Inscriptions*, 212) does not adequately fit the traces.

⁽⁸⁹⁾ The *waw* is not clear in the photographs. The name may therefore be the hypocoristic *qny*.

⁽⁹⁰⁾ Concerning this name Aharoni remarks: "All the letters are clear enough, even the final *resh*. The apparent double divider at the end is actually a combination of the head of the *resh* and the word divider (the spot that is under that sign is not ink but only a brown fleck)" (Y. AHARONI, "Three Hebrew Ostraca from Arad", *BASOR* 197 [1970] 20, n. 11).

⁽⁹¹⁾ The second letter could also be a *dalet* (*q_dy*).

šryhw	1) <i>ErIs</i> 12 (1975), p. 69 (Hebrew) 2) <i>IEJ</i> 28 (1978), p. 56
šrmk	<i>ErIs</i> 12 (1975), p. 69 (Hebrew)
š'l	1) Va 178; V 178 2) <i>ErIs</i> 12 (1975), p. 70 (Hebrew)
šb'l	Gibeon jar handle 21
šby	1) *D 200, 43; Va 43 2) IR 32.2 3) IR 33.7/8 (Yabneh-yam)
šbn'	1) D 214, 57; M 69, 57; Va 57; V 57 2) M 78, 16; IR 86 ⁽⁹²⁾ ; IS 18 3) Va 168 4) Va 223 5) IR 85; IS 18
šbnyhw	1) D 122, 5 a; IS 24 2) D 175, 15; M 67, 15; Va 15 ⁽⁹³⁾ 3) D 179, 20; Va 20 4) D 218, 61; M 69, 61; Va 61 5) *M 60, 23; Va 143 6) V 257 7) A 60.3 8) <i>ErIs</i> 12 (1975), p. 68 (Hebrew) 9) <i>ErIs</i> 15 (1981), p. 304 (Hebrew)
šb'	1) SO 2.6 2) <i>ErIs</i> 12 (1975), pp. 69-70 (Hebrew)
šhr	1) M 78, 16; IR 86; IS 19 2) Va 223 3) <i>Ramat Rahel</i> (1959-1960), p. 44; fig. 31, 2; pl. 27, 2; IR 87; IS 20
šhrhr	D 194, 35; Va 35 ⁽⁹⁴⁾
šknyhw	<i>ErIs</i> 12 (1975), p. 67 (Hebrew)
šlm	1) *D 215, 58; Va 58; V 58 2) D 341, 10.a; M 83, 10 a; IS 16 3) D 343, 29 c; M 83, 29 c; Va 121; V 121; IS 15 4) M 60, 27; Va 147; V 147; IS 81 5) M 83, 27; Va 120 6) A 35.3 7) Lachish 3.20 8) <i>Semitica</i> 26 (1976), p. 49 9) <i>Semitica</i> 26 (1976), p. 51
šlmyhw	1) M 60, 24; Va 144; IR 132 (and p. 131 of the Hebrew section); IS 53 2) A 108; IS 54 3) <i>ErIs</i> 12 (1975), p. 69 (Hebrew)
šm'b	M 53, 5; Va 128
šmyh	A 110.1 (English edition)
šm'	1) D 176, 16; M 67, 16; Va 16 2) D 224, 68; M 70, 68; Va 68; V 68; IR 18; IS 3 3) Va 167; V 167 4) Va 245; IS 70 5) <i>IEJ</i> 18 (1968), pp. 181-187 6) IS 55
šm'y	Va 246 ⁽⁹⁵⁾ ; IS 87
šm'yhw	1) *D 199, 40; M 68, 40; Va 40; V 40 2) IR 32.4 3) A 27.2 4) A 31.5 5) A 39.2 6) A 39.8 7) Lachish 4.6
šmryhw	1) A 18.4 2) <i>Semitica</i> 26 (1976), p. 47, no. 4 3) <i>Semitica</i> 26 (1976), p. 47, no. 5
šmryw	1) SO 1.1/2, 13.2, 14.2, 21.1/2 2) Va 214; IR 39; IS 35

⁽⁹²⁾ The photograph in *Inscriptions Reveal* clearly shows that the first name should be read *šbn'* on the seals from Tell en-Naṣbeh and not *šbnt* as read by McCown (Chester Charlton McCown, *Tell en-Naṣbeh. I. Archaeological and Historical Results* [Berkeley 1947; New Haven 1974] 160-162).

⁽⁹³⁾ The theophoric element may be *-yw* instead of *-yhw*. The photographs are not clear enough to decide.

⁽⁹⁴⁾ The penultimate letter is *hē* not *het*. Note that the top horizontal breaks through to the right of the vertical, a characteristic of *hē* not *het* in this period.

⁽⁹⁵⁾ Traces of an *'ayin* and a *yod* after the *mem* seem fairly clear, and we prefer this reading to Avigad's *šm*.

- š'l 1) D 200, 41; M 68, 41; Va 41 2) A 49.14 3) IS 76 4) *Semitica* 26 (1976), pp. 51-52 5) *Semitica* 27 (1977), pp. 21-22⁽⁹⁶⁾
- š'ryhw 1) *Semitica* 26 (1976), p. 45 2) *Semitica* 26 (1976), p. 46
- špt 1) M 57, 17; Va 137; V 137; IR 124; IS 37 2) *Magnalia Dei*, pp. 295-296; fig. 12, 2
- šptyhw 1) M 56, 16; Va 109; IR 125; IS 50 2) *Semitica* 26 (1976), pp. 50-51
- tnhm 1) M 75, 7 2) M 76, 12; 3) Va 187 4) Va 192 5) A 39.4 6) *Ramat Rahel* (1961-1962), p. 32; fig. 37, 5; pl. 40, 5

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Rome

Robert LAWTON, S.J.

⁽⁹⁶⁾ Lemaire reads this as *šl*, but I agree with Teixidor in reading *š'l* ("Bulletin d'épigraphie sémitique", *Syria* 56 [1979] 378, § 111). Although the 'ayin is squeezed close to the lamed, its traces are clearly visible.

ANIMADVERSIONES

Why "Matthew" in Matt 9,9-13?

In Matt 9,9-13, the Evangelist follows the broad outline of Mark 2,13-17⁽¹⁾. The Matthean version, however, makes two major changes which distinguish this story from Mark's version (as well as from the analogous verses in Luke):

1) The name of the collector whom Jesus summons is not "Levi, son of Alphaeus", but "Matthew" (9,9).

2) Jesus explains his action in having a meal with tax collectors and sinners by saying "Go and learn what it means 'I desire mercy and not sacrifice'" (Matt 9,13; Hos 6,6).

The task of the present article is to explain these two variations in relation to one another.

We turn our attention first to the change of name. At first glance, the simplest option for understanding the name-change Levi to Matthew would be to say that the first Evangelist just knew that the one summoned was named Matthew. But that is problematic because the weight of Mark and Luke war against it.

Among past commentators, one of the most popular ways of explaining the name-change from Levi to Matthew is to say that the Evangelist is disturbed that Levi does not occur in Mark's list of apostles (Mark 3,13-19), and with this pericope excludes him from a personal call⁽²⁾. It is certainly plausible that the Evangelist desired to assert that the tax-collector was no "ordinary" person, but an Apostle. Indeed, the fact in Mark 2,14 that Levi, son of Alphaeus, was called, though not an Apostle, bothered many scribes,

⁽¹⁾ I dedicate this article to my nephew, Matthew Christian, who was born at about the same time that I initially made this observation about the call of Matthew.

Lohmeyer's suggestion that both the first and second gospels are dependent on oral tradition and independent of each other, cited in H. ZIMMERMAN, *Neutestamentliche Methodenlehre* (Stuttgart 1967) 93, does not adequately take into account both the internal similarities in the pertinent accounts as well as their similar placement between the stories of the healing of the paralytic and the dispute about fasting.

Since W. FARMER, *The Synoptic Problem* (New York 1964) 246, offers no evidence for his contention that Mark epitomizes the first gospel here, I proceed with the generally accepted order of priority, i.e. Matthew used Mark.

⁽²⁾ R. PESCH, "Levi/Matthaeus (Mc 2,14/Mt 9,9, 19,3) Ein Beitrag zur Lösung eines alten Problems", *ZNW* 59 (1968) 40 f.

B. LINDARS, "Matthew, Levi, Lebbaeus and the value of the Western Text", *NTS* 4 (1957-58) 220.

and for example, led D Θ Ferrar It to insert in the call of the tax collector at Mark 2,14 the name "James, son of Alphaeus", since James was an apostle⁽³⁾. But the problem with this theory is that it does not go on to explain why the first Evangelist chose the name Matthew from the list of the apostles. Why not Thomas or Bartholomew?

One theory says that Levi is replaced here because he was not an apostle but goes on to suggest that the name Matthew was chosen because it is the only name in the Apostle list which is Levite (thus reflecting the name of the replaced tax collector)⁽⁴⁾. That is possible. But it presupposes that the Evangelist requests the reader a) to make the equation Μαθθαῖος = Ματθαῖος and b) make the identification Ματθαῖος = a Levitical name, an identification for which there is no hint in the text.

One theory attributes the name-change to a purely mechanical error⁽⁵⁾. The first Evangelist, in this view, found a list of the Twelve Apostles which read "Matthew the tax collector James son of Alphaeus", in which "the tax collector", perhaps written in the margin, was intended to refer to James (thus consonant with the reading of D in Mark 2,14). The First Evangelist however, according to the theory, read "the tax collector" to refer to Matthew and thus installed the name Matthew in his account of the tax collector's call at Matt 9,9-13. This too is possible. But the theory presupposes that the order Matthew-James in the Apostle list existed prior to the first Evangelist, for which there is no evidence. (Mark, even in D, as well as Luke, read "Thomas-James").

One method of dealing with the name-change would relate it to the report of Papias that "Matthew compiled the sayings in the Hebrew language but everyone translated them as he was able⁽⁶⁾." On the basis of that evidence, one would say that the first Evangelist lifted the name Matthew into special prominence because he knew that the Apostle Matthew was the source of the Hebrew sayings of the Lord which the first Evangelist was using in the construction of the gospel. But that possibility must remain only one among many partial solutions, if for none other than the simple fact that this passage does not discuss authorship of the gospel.

Another method of explaining the name-change, and here I end my survey, is to say that the Evangelist and the Matthew of the Hebrew saying were one and the same person, and that Matthew is here "getting his name into print⁽⁷⁾." But this thesis is troublesome on two counts:

⁽³⁾ And the fact that Levi received a call, though not an apostle, led D and It to bring Levi into the list of the apostles under the Latin name Lebbaeus at Mark 3,18. But bringing Levi into the list of Apostles meant that someone had to go. Mark 3,18 in D has Lebbaeus replace Thaddeus. Matt 10,3 does the same in D, African Old Latin, K, and the Latin version of Origen. In Matt 10,3 the Caesarean and Koine texts try to ameliorate Thaddeus' omission by saying "Thaddeus who was called Lebbaeus".

⁽⁴⁾ M. D. GOULDER, *Midrash and Lection in Matthew* (London 1974) 324-25.

⁽⁵⁾ B. BACON, *Studies in Matthew* (New York 1930) 39-40.

⁽⁶⁾ EUSEBIUS, *Eccl. Hist.* 3.39.16.

⁽⁷⁾ Zahn's variation on this thesis is discussed in BACON, (*Studies in Matt.*)

- the already-mentioned fact that this passage does not discuss the gospel's authorship, and
- the unlikelihood that the Apostle Matthew, an eyewitness, would have constructed a gospel based on Mark, which this gospel does.

It should here be emphasized that we need not mistrust Papias when he reports concerning the Matthew of the Hebrew sayings. One can readily believe that, according to one tradition, someone named Matthew in some sense contributed toward the creation of this gospel. The evidence of the passage to be adduced, however, should make it clear that the report about a certain Matthew's role in the formulation of the gospel should be seen as inadequate of itself to explain the changes made in ch. 9, that the reason for those changes is revealed by the text itself. (Just as to assert that the name Matthew was chosen to lend an apostolic mantle to the tax-collector is inadequate of itself to explain the changes made in 9,9-13.)

I suggest that the most cogent explanation for the switch from the name Levi to Matthew is revealed in the Evangelist's second major alteration in the Marcan framework. After repeating Mark's double mention of the μαθηταί in Matt 9,10-11, the Evangelist has Jesus introduce the Hosea quotation with the phrase "πορευθέντες δὲ μάθετε", "go and learn". The phrase has a rabbinic equivalent לֵךְ וְלִמְדוּ⁽⁸⁾. But the formula used here is unique in all the first gospel. All other controversy Scripture quotes in this gospel are introduced by verbs of "understanding", γινώσκειν (12,7) or of "reading", ἀναγινώσκειν (12,3,5; 19,4; 21,16,42; 22,31).

Again calling to mind that the Evangelist has preserved both occurrences of μαθηταί in his Marcan base, I suggest that he saw in μαθηταί an opportunity to underline with μάθετε the learning process which is involved for a disciple.

This seems borne out by the fact that the link between learning and discipleship, present here, is present elsewhere in the gospel. The one who has become a disciple is compared to / is exemplified in the scribe who is acquainted with both the new and old at 13,52. Being a disciple involves being taught the commands of the Lord at 28,19,20⁽⁹⁾. Further, the reference

38-40. Zahn says that Matthew and Levi are two names for the same person. His thesis comes under the same criticism discussed in my text, ad loc.

⁽⁸⁾ *Seder Elijah*, 18, in discussing progeny: "Go and learn from our father Abraham (and Sarah) who was sterile for 75 years", quoted in J. J. WETTSTEIN, *Novum Testamentum Graecum* (Amsterdam 1751) 359. Also cf. W. BACHER, *Die älteste Terminologie der jüdischen Schriftauslegung* (Leipzig 1899) 94-96.

⁽⁹⁾ The only other use of μαθητεύω, at 27,57, does not define its functional content.

It is noteworthy that the form μάθετε is precisely the form which most strongly reflects the μαθ- constellation present in the passage. Other controversy Scripture quotes in the gospel are introduced with indicative verbs ἐγνώκετε 12,7 and ἀνέγνωτε 12,5. An indicative form of μαθηάω here would have been ἐμάθετε. By choosing to relate an imperative form, the Evangelist has chosen the vehicle which most strongly clues the reader in to his program.

to Jesus as "teacher" in Matt 9,11 is peculiar to this version, and serves in part to underline the learning-discipleship motif⁽¹⁰⁾.

Most importantly for our present purposes, just as μάθετε defines a characteristic of being a μαθητής, so Μαθθαῖος is the one name from Mark's list of Apostles which best reflects the μαθητής identity⁽¹¹⁾. The etymological link is much stronger, of course, between μάθετε and μαθητής (מָלַךְ learn and מָלַךְ disciple was an etymological pun also available in Hebrew) than between either Greek word and Μαθθαῖος. Μαθθαῖος in its pure etymology is a form of Ματθαῖος, derivative in turn from the participial form of ματῶ, to give⁽¹²⁾. The four occurrences of the μαθ-constellation in this passage are not etymologically similar in origin. But to observe the fact that the Evangelist has broken our rules is simply to observe that he is not playing our game. He has given four clear signals in the text of the game which he is playing⁽¹³⁾.

The process at work here is not wholly unrelated to that in 1,21.23 "You will call his name Jesus since he will 'save' his people from their sins"; "They will call his name 'Emmanuel', i.e. 'God with us'. Whether or not one distinguishes these verses from those in ch. 9 by calling these "translations" and the ch. 9 example "(false) etymology", both these ch. 1 verses and the ones in ch. 9 perform identical functions, i.e. they underline the significance of a name⁽¹⁴⁾.

It should be noted that while Matthew is chosen from the apostolic list, his name here functions as the apostolic representative of that learning-discipleship to which all addressees of the gospel are invited⁽¹⁵⁾. He is not here a once-only event who can only be admired by subsequent generations.

⁽¹⁰⁾ I am grateful to A. VANHOYE, S.J., for this last observation. It should be noted that, though Mark uses the verb διδάσκειν in 2,13, it constitutes the setting which precedes the tax-collector's call.

⁽¹¹⁾ No special significance is to be attached to the fact that in 9,9 the Evangelist precedes "Matthew" with λεγόμενος. It is simply the gospel's way of saying "whose name was". E.g. 13,55.

⁽¹²⁾ This information kindly supplied by Prof. John STRUGNELL of Harvard Divinity School.

⁽¹³⁾ One can, of course, simply lend great weight to the fact that the Fathers did not report that they heard "Matthew = learning disciple" and end all discussion. In so doing, however, one foregoes the responsibility to deal with the particulars of this passage. The inner Greek word play has a history in Biblical literature. Cf. σχίσαι-σχίνος, πρίσαι-πρίνος in the History of Susanna 54-59 cited in S. JELICOE, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford 1968) 103.

⁽¹⁴⁾ There is a strong tradition in Greek and Latin literature of attempted etymologies for names. For example, PLUTARCH, *Quest. Conviv.* 4.6.2, tries to explain the name 'Levites' as coming from "Lysios (Releaser) or better, from Evius (God of the Cry)". TACITUS, *Histories* 5.1.2, saw the name 'Judaei' ... as "a barbarous lengthening of 'Idaei', the name of the people dwelling around the famous Mount Ida in Crete".

⁽¹⁵⁾ Matt 28,19.20.

What the disciple learns in this passage is the place of mercy in God's plan, a special emphasis of the gospel throughout: the central beatitude is mercy 5,7; also cf. 9,2; 11,28-30; 18,21-35; 25,31-46.

Summary and Conclusion

We have earlier noted that since the passage does not discuss the gospel's authorship, one may not simply appeal to the person of Matthew, author of the Hebrew sayings, in order to explain the use of the name Matthew in this passage. The thrust of this article has been to suggest that the first Evangelist lifts the name Matthew into special prominence because, in context of this story, the name is a symbol of that "learning-discipleship" with which the gospel is elsewhere concerned. Granting that, let me initiate discussion by closing on a speculative note concerning what the passage may indirectly have to tell us about the authorship of the gospel⁽¹⁶⁾. Is it possible that the gospel was ascribed to that person who in his very name reflects the learning-discipleship which the gospel at several points promotes? And if that is the case, may we see the report of Papias about the Matthew of the Hebrew sayings as the attempt of one tradition to explain the fact that the first gospel was ascribed to Matthew?

St. Jerome's College
Waterloo, Ontario
Canada N2L 3G3

Mark KILEY

⁽¹⁶⁾ One final (and equally speculative) observation seems appropriate concerning the first Evangelist's treatment of the Apostle-list in Mark 3,13-19. The first Evangelist, not surprisingly in view of the change he made in ch. 9, has called the Matthew of the apostle-list "the tax-collector". But more interesting is the fact that, as already noticed, Mark 3,18 and its Lucan parallel list three Apostles in the order Matthew - Thomas - James, whereas the first Evangelist reads Thomas - Matthew - James. The first Evangelist, who knew Mark's text, anticipates the question of others who knew it, "Why did you omit Levi, son of Alphaeus from his call?" The Evangelist had a two-part answer:

"1) The person to whom Levi lost his call is Matthew, no less than an apostle, and

2) such a change does little damage to the honor of the Alphaeus family; after all, James son of Alphaeus is an apostle." For "ready reference", the Evangelist has placed the two parts of his answer together: Matthew - James.

Sur la salutation de Gabriel à Marie (Lc 1,28)

L'annonce faite par Gabriel à Marie dans l'Évangile de l'Enfance tient en quelques mots: Χαῖρε κεχαριτωμένη, ὁ Κύριος μετὰ σοῦ. Saint Jérôme, avec les moyens que lui fournit la langue latine, traduit: «Ave, gratia plena, Dominus tecum» et nous, à sa suite, «je vous salue, pleine de grâce, le Seigneur est avec vous».

On ne se rend en général pas compte du problème posé par les deux mots initiaux, et eux seuls, χαῖρε κεχαριτωμένη, «Ave, gratia plena». L'annonce faite, Gabriel reste un instant silencieux pour donner à celle qui l'écoute le temps d'en mesurer la force, déjà manifeste dans les deux premiers mots.

Χαῖρε, «ave», «réjouissez-vous», est la salutation chez ceux, juifs ou non, qui s'expriment en grec⁽¹⁾. Dans la Septante, au contraire, c'est le mot εἰρήνη, *pax*, que l'on emploie normalement pour souhaiter le bonjour. La salutation ne s'y fait pas *dans la joie*. Elle se fait *dans la paix*: «La paix soit avec vous»⁽²⁾.

Il est remarquable que quatre «saluts» de la Septante fassent exception à cet usage: Zacharie 9,9-10; Sophonie 3,14-17; Joël 2,21-27; Lamentations 4,21. Les quatre passages méritent l'attention. Ils se distinguent de tous les autres comportant le verbe χαίρειν, parce que, chaque fois, ce verbe est employé à l'impératif pour introduire une annonce messianique, celle de la présence de Dieu sauveur au milieu de son peuple, une annonce qui accompagne une invitation à la joie⁽³⁾.

Marie a été «bouleversée» (διεταράχθη, *turbata est*)⁽⁴⁾ par les mots qu'elle vient d'entendre. Elle se demande, et la surprise est naturelle, «de quel pays provient cette salutation-là», une salutation inaccoutumée dans son peuple. Elle n'ose penser qu'elle vient du ciel. L'ange la rassure: Μὴ φοβοῦ, *Ne timeas*, «Cessez votre frayeur», et il va dire pourquoi il faut la faire cesser⁽⁵⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Elle s'oppose à la salutation ironique adressée à Jésus (Mt 27,29; Mc 15,18; Jn 19,3).

⁽²⁾ Dans les évangiles, cf. Mt 10,13; Lc 10,5; Jn 20,19.21.26.

⁽³⁾ Cette remarque sur les «saluts» de la Septante est due au R.P. Ceslas Spica, d'après St. Lyonnet, *Le récit de l'Annonciation et la Maternité divine de la Sainte Vierge*, (Rome 1956).

⁽⁴⁾ Le verbe grec a d'autant plus de force que c'est son seul emploi dans le N.T.

⁽⁵⁾ Luc respecte l'usage grec, que le latin n'a pas assez de temps pour rendre: une défense s'exprime en grec par un *subjonctif aoriste* pour une action qu'il ne faut pas *se mettre à faire*, et par l'*impératif présent* pour une action qu'il ne faut pas *continuer à faire*, autrement dit une action qui doit *cesser*; cf. Lc 1,13; 5,10; 8,50; 12,32; Ac 18,9 etc.

Cependant, nourrie de la Bible, l'attention immédiatement mise en éveil, elle a déjà saisi le sens de la parole de l'ange. Déjà elle se sait appelée à donner au monde un Sauveur. Sa frayeur ne va pas sans la joie. Bénié à jamais, elle a déjà senti et compris.

A nous, maintenant, d'ouvrir les yeux, dans l'évangile, sur l'impératif de l'ange, χαῖτε, devant lequel nous sommes aveugles. On sait que le verbe χαίρειν signifie «se réjouir», et il est normal que, dans cet instant ineffable où le Seigneur envoie un ange pour annoncer au monde une ère et une alliance nouvelles, la salutation angélique exprime moins le *salut* adressé à Marie que la *joie* mise dans le cœur d'une mère choisie par Dieu pour le salut des hommes.

Cette joie est clairement exprimée par le texte grec. L'impératif du texte inspiré tire le plein de son sens du participe parfait passif qui le suit, celui d'un *verbe* dont le mode, la voix et le temps ne sauraient être rendus par un *adjectif*, fût-il précisé par un substantif, «(gratia) plena», «pleine de grâce». De multiples raisons l'interdisent.

D'abord le verbe χαριτώ est formé sur le mot χάρις, la «grâce», un mot senti par saint Luc, et non sans raison, comme parent du verbe χαίρω⁽⁶⁾. Et notre évangéliste, qui manie son grec avec une parfaite aisance, a l'adresse de mettre le verbe en valeur par l'allitération d'une «figura etymologica», en rapprochant l'impératif χαῖτε du participe κεχαριτωμένη.

Ensuite, et davantage, il nous invite à nous rappeler la construction des verbes grecs exprimant un sentiment, ou une émotion, comme la surprise, l'indignation, la tristesse et, dans le cas présent, la joie. L'usage veut que la proposition *complétive* commandée par ces verbes soit mise au *participe*.

Il veut encore que, si le sujet, dans la subordonnée, est le même que dans la principale, il n'y soit pas exprimé, et que les mots qui se rapportent à lui soient au nominatif, à commencer naturellement par le participe. Ce participe est l'équivalent d'un complément direct: il *complète* immédiatement l'idée du verbe principal sans être séparé de lui par quelque idée intermédiaire. Il confère au verbe principal, dont il dépend, et qui serait incomplet sans lui, son sens et sa force⁽⁷⁾. Visible est la différence de sens entre les mots

(6) Les verbes en -ώω signifient la plénitude. P. Chantraine, dans son *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (Klincksieck 1968), traduit le verbe χαριτώ par «manifester une grâce divine» et note qu'il est employé surtout au passif, «être rempli de cette grâce (LXX, N.T. etc.)». Il ajoute que le substantif abstrait χάρις doit être un déverbatif de χαίρω (dont χαῖτε est l'impératif présent).

(7) Quelquefois, ce qui n'est pas le cas ici, la complétive est remplacée par une circonstancielle et la subordonnée, au lieu d'être complétive, peut être introduite par un ὅτι (se réjouir *parce que*), qui indique la cause du sentiment éprouvé, ou encore par un εἰ s'il s'agit plutôt d'une condition (se réjouir *si*). Mais la construction courante est celle du participe, à sens complétif. Si εἰ ne se rencontre pas dans le N.T., on trouve deux exemples de ὅτι, et dans le même verset de Lc 10,20. — Entre autres exemples du participe complétif: Ac 13,48, ἀκούοντα ἔχαιρον = «ils se réjouissaient d'écouter»; 16,34, ἡγαλλιάσατο πεπιστευκώς (participe *parfait*, comme ici) = «il fut dans l'allégresse de posséder la foi»; ou encore Lc 23,8; Jn 20,20. En ce cas, mais seulement en général, le participe n'est pas

«réjouissez-vous, pleine de grâce», et «réjouissez-vous d'être pleine de grâce». Dans le premier cas, rien ne dit pour quelle raison Marie est invitée à se réjouir: elle peut croire à un simple «bonjour». Dans le second, elle sait d'abord pour quelle raison elle est priée de se réjouir; elle sait ensuite qu'elle est, déjà, dès l'instant même, pour toujours, pleine de grâce.

La langue latine, en ne possédant pas de participe présent passif, condamne saint Jérôme à ne pas traduire mot pour mot le participe parfait passif du grec, un participe qui possède le sens du présent de la chose pleinement acquise. Mais fallait-il remplacer un verbe par un adjectif? Fatalement le *nominatif* du verbe est trahi par le *vocatif* de l'adjectif («*gratia plena*»), un vocatif encore souligné dans la prière latine et française par l'adjonction du vocatif *Maria*, «Marie», à qui l'on s'adresse⁽⁸⁾.

Si le sens devient dès lors aussi évident que certain, il reste l'embarras de le rendre sans rien enlever à la plénitude ni à la richesse de ses nuances. Il faudrait faire sentir que l'impératif grec contient à la fois une salutation et une invitation à se réjouir, et que l'idée de joie l'emporte largement sur celle de salutation; il faudrait aussi traduire, dans le participe complétif, toute sa force de *parfait*, qui indique une possession *parfaite*; il faudrait enfin trouver le moyen de reproduire l'allitération réussie par saint Luc autour du mot χάρις, la «grâce».

La version la moins longue, sans être inexacte, serait de faire dire à Gabriel: «Réjouissez-vous de posséder la grâce», mais elle serait incomplète. On sacrifierait une grande partie du sens, malgré le recours à six mots pour en traduire deux. Pour n'omettre aucune des idées concentrées en deux mots pour Marie par un ange, et par un artiste de la langue, il en faudrait une kyrielle.

Il faudrait trouver quelque chose comme «La joie soit avec vous⁽⁹⁾ de jouir d'une grâce parfaite». On rendrait peut-être ainsi l'idée d'une joie sans

à l'aoriste. A l'aoriste, il peut être encore complétif, ou jugé tel, mais il a plus souvent une valeur circonstancielle de *temps*, et marque ainsi la *succession* des faits ou des sentiments; cf. Ac 11,23; 15,31; 16,38 (après ἐφοβήθησαν); peut-être Mt 2,10; Mc 14,11. Après *ave*, le latin ne peut évidemment pas fournir des exemples analogues: il lui faudrait, au lieu de *ave*, employer *gaude*, ou *laetare*; mais après ces impératifs le participe est inconcevable: sauf en cas de causale introduite par *quod*, le latin veut une proposition à l'infinitif avec un sujet donné; un simple infinitif complétif, sans être impossible, est rare et peu correct.

(8) Au grec χαίρε correspond le latin *ave*, un mot qui, sans le traduire, est senti par les Latins comme l'impératif d'un verbe *avere*. Mais, comme *ave* ne signifie rien d'autre que «bonjour», ou «salut», une telle façon de s'adresser à quelqu'un n'implique aucune idée complétive. Il n'y a donc rien d'étonnant si saint Jérôme a fait suivre «ave» d'un *adjectif*, et au *vocatif*, «*plena*», sans prêter attention à l'emploi fait par le grec, après un verbe de sentiment, d'un *participe au nominatif* κεχαριτωμένη.

(9) Ou bien «soyez dans la joie de...», ou «hommage à votre joie de...», ou encore «je salue votre joie de...» La première formule, ci-dessus, a l'avantage de rappeler l'autre forme du salut: «La paix soit avec vous». Le défaut de toutes est la longueur. — On notera en passant que la traduction, quelquefois adoptée, du type «Réjouis-toi, toi à qui une grâce a été faite» n'est pas possible. Pour qu'elle le soit, il faudrait que le participe grec fût un *aoriste* et non un *parfait*.

réserve ni mélange, donnée à Marie par la plénitude de la grâce, et du même coup la «figura etymologica» serait respectée par le rapport entre la *joie* et le verbe *jouir*; la syntaxe grecque enfin reconnue ferait saisir la construction voulue par le vrai sens de la phrase. Mais la condition première est un retour au texte grec⁽¹⁰⁾.

Une vieille erreur de sens infiniment répétée tire sa force de l'habitude et finit, à des yeux qui ne savent plus voir, par revêtir les apparences du vrai. Il faut un don Quichotte pour la combattre. On n'a certes pas la prétention d'imposer une version neuve, ni même de la proposer. On estime préférable de s'en tenir, au moins pour la prière, à la version traditionnelle, même si elle s'écarte de saint Luc: elle est dite, et par des hommes, après que l'annonce est devenue réalité.

Il n'a pas paru inutile, cependant, de remettre en lumière la valeur de deux mots, sans doute révélés par Marie elle-même à l'évangéliste de l'Enfance — qui nous les rapporte à son tour en bon grec — afin de montrer quelques aspects d'une annonce dont le succès va couper en deux l'histoire des hommes.

«La Giride»

84210 La Roque sur Pernes

France

Edouard DELEBECQUE

⁽¹⁰⁾ Si l'on se reporte à ma traduction de l'*Évangile de Luc* (Paris 1976), on pourra constater qu'elle est ici plusieurs fois corrigée. — Quant au point de départ de l'alliance des versets 28 et 42 du premier chapitre de Luc dans l'*Ave Maria*, il est difficile de le dater exactement. Cette alliance est amorcée dans les onciaux A, C, D, etc., et la Vulgate, et le R.P. Spicq renvoie au *Protévangile de Jacques* XI,1; Tertullien, *De virginibus velandis*, 6; Eusèbe, *Démonstration Évangélique* VII,11.

Actes 20,3-6

Note additionnelle sur l'article de *Biblica*, 64 (1983) 556-564, «Les deux versions du voyage de saint Paul de Corinthe à Troas (Actes 20,3-6)»:

Non sans raison, mon collègue Lucien Pernée, propose de comprendre, en Actes 20,4 et 5, que, parmi les sept compagnons de Paul qui gagnent Troas, il convient de distinguer deux groupes et de mettre à part Tychique et Trophime.

Si Luc a indiqué de quelles villes de Macédoine sont originaires les compagnons de Paul, c'est pour indiquer le point exact où l'apôtre les a pris en chemin dans le trajet de Corinthe à Troas.

Les deux Asiates, Tychique et Trophime, eux, sont partis non pas de Macédoine mais d'Éphèse. Par rapport aux cinq autres, donc, ils ont fait leur voyage en sens inverse. Mais pour tous le point de ralliement est Troas.

Cette interprétation, que je résume, est à mes yeux parfaitement juste. On traduira donc le texte court: «(v. 4) Il avait pour compagnons Sopater, fils de Pyrrhus, de Bérée, puis, de Thessalonique Aristarque et Secundus, avec le Derbéen Gaïos, et Timothée; puis, d'Asie, Tychique et Trophime. (v. 5) Mais ces derniers étaient venus à notre rencontre; ils nous attendaient à Troas.»

Texte long: «(v. 4) Alors, comme il allait partir, (devaient l'accompagner) jusqu'en Asie Sopater, fils de Pyrrhus, de Bérée, de Thessalonique Aristarque et Secundus, avec le Dobérien Gaïos, et Timothée. Quant aux Ephésiens Tychique et Trophime, (v. 5) [...] ceux-ci, partis avant, l'attendaient à Troas.»

Il n'y a aucun désaccord entre les deux textes. Le second est plus exact et plus clair.

La Giride
84210 La Roque sur Pernes
France

Edouard DELEBECQUE

The Accusation and the Accusers at Philippi (Acts 16,20-21) *

According to Acts 16,16-19, the troubles in Philippi began when Paul, by use of the name of Jesus Christ, forced a "python spirit" to leave a slave girl; as the girl's owners had previously derived "much gain" from her soothsaying services, they were aggrieved and brought Paul and Silas before the city's magistrates. In the following study, we shall investigate what Luke meant by their accusation and, aided by the latter, who the accusers are supposed to have been.

²⁰Καὶ προσαγαγόντες αὐτοὺς τοῖς στρατηγοῖς εἶπαν, Οὗτοι οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἐκταράσσουσιν ἡμῶν τὴν πόλιν Ἰουδαῖοι ὑπάρχοντες,

²¹καὶ καταγγέλλουσιν ἔθνη ἃ οὐκ ἐξεστὶν ἡμῖν παραδέχεσθαι οὐδὲ ποιεῖν Ῥωμαίοις οὖσιν.

1. The Accusation

Jewish persecution of Christians is a very frequent theme in Acts(!); at times, such persecution takes the form of an accusation of anti-Romanism, which, however, the Roman authorities recognize as unfounded(?). The above-cited accusation at Philippi, however, is taken to be exceptional, for, according to the virtually unanimous interpretation of the incident, while charges of anti-Romanism and apparent official recognition of their baselessness (vv. 35-39) are present, those who bring the charges are Gentiles and the

(*) I would like to thank the Maiersdorf Fund for my appointment as Maiersdorf Lecturer in Jewish History at Hebrew University, 1981-1984.

(¹) Inter alia: Acts 4,1-3; 5,17-18; 6,8-14; 7,52.57-58; 8,1-4; 9,1-2.23 (contrast 2 Cor 11,32-33!); 12,3; 13,6-8.45.50; 14,19; 17,5.13; 18,6.12; 19,9; 20,3; 21,11.27; 22,22; 23,12-15.30; 24,27; 25,2-3; 28,19. Cf. A. GEORGE, "Israël dans l'œuvre de Luc", *RB* 75 (1968) 519-520.

(²) Accusation: Acts 17,5-7; 18,13 (deliberately vague?); 24,5. Roman recognition of guiltlessness: Acts 13,12; 18,14-16; 24,24-25; 25,25 (cf. 26,31-32); 28,18.31 (ἀκωλύτως in Rome). See also Luke 23,2 with *ibid.* vv. 4.14-23.47. On this apologetic, see H. CONZELMANN, *Die Mitte der Zeit: Studien zur Theologie des Lukas* (BHT 17; Tübingen ³1960) 128-135; J. DUPONT, "Aequitas Romana: Notes sur Actes 25,16", *RSR* 49 (1961) 355 (= *idem*, *Études sur les Actes des Apôtres* [LD 45; Paris 1967] 528); J. SPEIGL, *Der römische Staat und die Christen* (Amsterdam 1970) 7-12; S. LÉGASSE, "L'apologétique à l'égard de Rome dans le procès de Paul: Actes 21,27-26,32", *RSR* 69 (1981 = *La parole de grâce: Études lucaniennes à la mémoire d'Augustin George*) 249-255; R. MADDOX, *The Purpose of Luke-Acts* (Göttingen 1982) 91-99.

accusation is not that Christianity is anti-Roman, but that Judaism is. More precisely, the charge is said to have been that of proselytizing Roman citizens to Judaism, which was forbidden to them⁽³⁾.

Instead of the usual motif, therefore, the Philippi incident is often said to represent one or two minor themes of Acts. First, together with the incident at Ephesus (19,23 ff.), it indicates Luke's view that when Gentiles oppose the Christian mission, they do so for economic reasons, Christianity being bad for pagan business⁽⁴⁾. Second, the Philippi incident is said to combine with that of Sosthenes at Corinth (18,17), as well as the Ephesus riot (again), to illustrate Luke's delight in portraying Gentile hostility to Jews⁽⁵⁾.

However, it may be doubted that either of these sub-themes accounts for the Philippi accusation. The first is complicated by the fact that while the Ephesus incident begins with Gentile resentment of Christianity's threat to pagan business, the scene before the tribunal includes Alexander's being put forward by Jews in order to make a defense speech (19,33). The meaning of this verse has long been obscure, as the textual variants indicate⁽⁶⁾, but it seems clear that the scene portrays the Jews of Ephesus as hostile toward the Christians: either Alexander was a non-Christian Jewish spokesman who had hoped to defend the Jewish community by dissociating it from the Christians⁽⁷⁾, or he was a Christian whom the Jewish community had accused and thrust forward toward the tribunal. In either case, this incident maintains the usual theme of Acts — in contrast to the Philippian incident.

⁽³⁾ Numerous commentators on our verses are cited by W. C. VAN UNNIK, who concludes that "Seit dem 17. Jh. wird meistens gesagt, dass es sich hier um die Einführung von neuen Göttern handelt, dass es den Römern nicht erlaubt war, diese anzunehmen, dass das Judentum zwar eine 'religio licita' war, aber keine Proselyten machen durfte" ("Die Anklage gegen die Apostel in Philippi [Apostelgeschichte xvi 20 ff]", *Mullus: Festschrift Theodor Klauser* [edd. A. STUIBER and A. HERMANN] [JAC Ergänzungsband 1; Münster/Westf. 1964] 367 = VAN UNNIK, *Sparsa Collecta*, I [NTS 29; Leiden 1973] 375-376). For two more recent examples, see E. HAENCHEN, "The Book of Acts as Source Material for the History of Early Christianity", *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert* (edd. L. E. KECK and J. L. MARTYN) (Nashville 1966) 273 ("Most likely the missionaries had overlooked the law which forbade Jewish propaganda among Roman citizens — who in those days was capable of recognizing that the Christian preaching about Jesus as the messiah was non-Jewish?") and LÉGASSE, "L'apologétique", 252 ("En effet, la prédication apostolique, assimilée à une propagande juive, tombait sous le coup de l'interdit qui frappait cette dernière, et c'est bien dans ce sens que vont les accusations formulées en Ac 16,20-21...").

⁽⁴⁾ See F. F. BRUCE, *Commentary on the Book of the Acts* (NICNT; Grand Rapids 1954) 335, n. 44; W. H. C. FREND, *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church* (Oxford 1965) 158. (Ibid., p. 159, Frend states that the plaintiffs at Philippi included Jews as well as pagans, but he brings no support for this view.)

⁽⁵⁾ H. J. CADBURY, *The Book of Acts in History* (New York 1955) 93-94.

⁽⁶⁾ See K. LAKE and H. J. CADBURY, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Part I, vol. IV (London 1933) 249. H. CONZELMANN (*Die Apostelgeschichte* [HNT 7; Tübingen 1972] 123) wonders if already Luke did not understand his source.

⁽⁷⁾ So, for example, BRUCE, *Commentary*, 400; E. HAENCHEN, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (MeyerK 3; Göttingen 1965) 509.

As for the second minor theme, Gentile anti-Semitism, while it does seem to be evidenced by the Ephesian crowd, the Sosthenes incident (18,17) is much more problematic, for it is not at all clear — as again the variants show — who he was or who attacked him; he may have been a Christian attacked by Jews⁽⁸⁾. In any case, the anti-Semitism reflected in the Philippiian incident (if it is) comes in the accusation's reference to the accused being Jewish and the mob's reaction in concert with the judges (16,22); this contrasts sharply with the two purported parallels, at Corinth and Ephesus, where the mobs expressed their hostility to Jews before, or after, the judges refused to move against the accused⁽⁹⁾.

The above considerations show that the Philippi incident is, if explained in the usual manner, truly isolated in Acts — a conclusion which, if possible, nonetheless awakens some doubt. To it, three other reasons for doubt may be added, all regarding the presumption that the practices alluded to in the accusation were Jewish⁽¹⁰⁾. First, if this was the accusers' intention, why are they not made to say so⁽¹¹⁾? As it is, Luke has them say that Paul and Silas are Jewish, and are teaching forbidden practices; but as "being Jewish" is, in the first instance, a matter of descent, it bears no necessary relationship to the practices taught. This is, I believe, an especially serious consideration in light of the fact that Acts frequently shows born Jews, who are now Christians, practicing and teaching non-Jewish practices (and beliefs) — and at times attacked for doing so⁽¹²⁾. Second, as a matter of fact, while the conversion of Roman citizens to Judaism was certainly not laudable, in Roman eyes, it was not forbidden by law until the mid-second century at the earliest, well after both the incident and the composition of Acts. This has been

⁽⁸⁾ See LAKE and CADBURY, *Beginnings*, 228.

⁽⁹⁾ This contrast is similarly formulated by VAN UNNIK, *Mullus*, 368 = *Sparsa Collecta*, 377.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Some might claim that already the term ἔθνη entails this presumption; H. PREISKER concluded his article on it with the statement that "So ist ἔθνος schliesslich Ausdruck für das ganze auf Mose zurückgeführte kultische Gesetzlichkeit Ag 6,14; 15,1; 16,21; 21,21; 26,31; 28,17" (*TWNT* II, 371). But the word never lost its general meaning (cf. 25,16); note that it is defined in 6,14; 15,1 and 21,21 by references to Moses, and in 26,3 and 28,17 by references to the Jews, while nothing of the sort appears in our verses. On ἔθνος see also DUPONT, "*Aequitas*", 358-359 (= *Études*, 531) and C. SPICQ, *Notes de lexicographie néo-testamentaire*, Supplément (Fribourg [Switzerland]-Göttingen 1982) 194-201.

⁽¹¹⁾ VAN UNNIK similarly protested against the view that the charge referred to the introduction of a new, Jewish, deity (instead of practices): "Wenn man das eine gemeint hat, weshalb hat man dann etwas anderes gesagt?" (*Mullus*, 367 = *Sparsa Collecta*, 376). His own solution (pp. 369-373 = 379-385) is that Jewish practices were condemned at Philippi as illegal for Romans, preaching of "the most High God" (Acts 16,17) being a reference to syncretistic Jewish preaching of the cult of Jupiter Sabazios, which had led to the expulsion of the Jews from Rome in 139 BCE (according to Valerius Maximus; see M. STERN, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*, I [Jerusalem 1974] 357-360). Here too, I believe that one might expect such a charge would have been stated more clearly (as was done by Valerius Maximus).

⁽¹²⁾ See above, n. 1.

shown quite clearly by A. N. Sherwin-White⁽¹³⁾, who for his own part suggested that the charge at Philippi was probably a very rare example of a condemnation on the basis of "incompatibility": "It is not because of the depravity of the practices introduced by Paul, but because of their un-Roman character [= lack of "public sanction of the State"], that the magistrates are urged to intervene"⁽¹⁴⁾. But then again we would wonder, with van Unnik (see n. 11), why the charge refers specifically to practices, instead of the cult as a whole. On the other hand, Roman condemnation of Christian practices as abominations ("flagitia") is well-known⁽¹⁵⁾. Third, it is surprising that while Paul and Silas are said to have been teaching in Philippi for several days prior to their arrest (vv. 12.18)⁽¹⁶⁾, and while they were certainly teaching Christianity, the accusation — according to the usual interpretation — charged them with teaching an undifferentiated Judaism⁽¹⁷⁾. Note too that Paul himself, when referring to the events in Philippi, in fact refers to his sufferings there as having been due to preaching the gospel of God (1 Thess 2,2).

If our opening discussion of the themes of Acts indicated that the usual interpretation of the Philippi incident relegates it to a surprising isolation, the latter three considerations argue that Paul and Silas were in fact charged with teaching what they really taught: Christianity. If that is the case, however, then the sense of Ἰουδαῖοι ὑπάρχοντες must be concessive: the accusers claim that *while* Paul and Silas are Jews, that which they are teaching is forbidden to Romans⁽¹⁸⁾ — in contrast to Jewish practices. This interpretation is supported by two further considerations. The first: in v. 37, Paul complains that he and Silas had been beaten and imprisoned Ῥωμαῖους ὑπάρχοντας; it is

⁽¹³⁾ A. N. SHERWIN-WHITE, *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament* (Sarum Lectures, 1960-1961; Oxford 1963) 81-82 (with n. 2).

⁽¹⁴⁾ Ibid., pp. 79-80. SHERWIN-WHITE admits that this explanation too leaves the Philippi incident "peculiarly" isolated.

⁽¹⁵⁾ H. JANNE, "Une affaire de christianisme sous Néron (65 apr. J.-C.)", *L'antiquité classique* 2 (1933) 331-336; A. HENRICHs, "Pagan Ritual and the Alleged Crimes of the Early Christians", *Kyriakon: Festschrift Johannes Quasten* (edd. P. GRANFIELD and J. A. JUNGSMANN, I (Münster/Westf. 1970) 18-35. Janne emphasizes the probable antiquity of these charges; so too A. G. ROOS, "Nero and the Christians", *Symbolae ad jus et historiam antiquitatis pertinentes Julio Christiano van Oven dedicatae* (edd. M. DAVID, B. A. VAN GRONINGEN and E. M. MEIJERS) (Leiden 1946) 300-301, n. 8.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Also the accusation itself seems to imply that preaching had continued for some time; see A. LOISY, *Les Actes des Apôtres* (Paris 1920) 639; HAENCHEN, *Apostelgeschichte*, 435, n. 2.

⁽¹⁷⁾ See above, n. 3. At least two commentators, however, have assumed that the accusers indeed knew that the missionaries had not been teaching usual Jewish practices: H. H. WENDT, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (MeyerK 3; Göttingen ¹1899) 281; A. STEINMANN, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Die heilige Schrift des NT; Bonn ¹1924) 139.

⁽¹⁸⁾ Luke's failure to use a particle (such as καίπερ) in order to clarify the concessive sense of the participle is not surprising but rather his rule; see F. BLASS, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (ed. A. DEBRUNNER) (Göttingen ¹³1970) 246 (§ 425,1).

significant that these words, which intentionally echo the accusation⁽¹⁹⁾, are obviously concessive: "although we are Romans"⁽²⁰⁾. The second: the statement in 16,20 that the accused Ἰουδαῖοι ὑπάρχοντες contrasts interestingly with the accusers' reference to themselves (v. 21): Ῥωμαῖοις οὐσιν⁽²¹⁾. Is this merely an example of Luke's love for varying his language⁽²²⁾? Is it not more likely that he is here distinguishing between ὑπάρχω, which originally implied "continuity with a previous state"⁽²³⁾, and simple εἰμί, "to be"? In other words, Luke seems to mean that the accusers admitted that the missionaries were Jews, although their teachings were not Jewish. That such a meaning is intended is indicated by several other passages of Luke-Acts where the same connotation of ὑπάρχω (whether in the sense of being or belonging) is apparently to be found; the first examples, as Acts 16,20-21, include the contrast with εἰμί, and the fifth, which refers to those who remained Jews although they had become Christians, is particularly illustrative of our passage.

Luke 9,48: "For whoever is the least among you is really great"⁽²⁴⁾.

Luke 14,33: "Anyone of you who does not forsake all that he has (until now had) cannot be my disciple".

Acts 4,32: "No one said that anything which had (until then) been his was his own".

Acts 16,3: "Paul circumcized Timothy out of fear of the Jews who were in those regions, for they all knew that Timothy's father had remained a Greek" (despite his marriage to a Jewess and his son's affiliation with the Church).

Acts 21,20: "There are myriads of Jewish believers who have remained zealous for the law".

⁽¹⁹⁾ Luke's irony here is noted by F. F. BRUCE, *New Testament History* (London 1969) 290, n. 2.

⁽²⁰⁾ So, for example, "obwohl wir Römer sind" (CONZELMANN, *Apostelgeschichte*, 102); "though we are Roman citizens" (LAKE and CADBURY, *Beginnings*, 200).

⁽²¹⁾ The contrast is not preserved by the Codex Bezae, which uses ὑπάρχω in both cases; this witness' preference for the latter, here and elsewhere, has been noted by C. MARTIN, "La tradition textuelle des Actes des Apôtres et les tendances de l'Église ancienne", *Les Actes des Apôtres: Traditions, rédaction, théologie* (edd. J. KREMER et al.) (BETL 48; Gembloux-Louvain 1979) 30. My thanks to my friend David Satran, who, in addition to other helpful advice, pointed out the contrast between the verbs in our verses.

⁽²²⁾ For which see H. J. CADBURY, «Four Features of Lucan Style», *Studies in Luke-Acts* (above, n. 3), 88-97.

⁽²³⁾ See J. H. MOULTON and G. MILLIGAN, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* (London 1914-1929) 650; BLASS-DEBRUNNER, *Grammatik*, 257-258 (§ 414,1). (Both tend to minimize the significance of this original meaning in New Testament Greek.)

⁽²⁴⁾ The translation is that of J. A. FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX)* (AB 28; Garden City, N.Y. 1981) 815. Here the distinction is taken to be between apparent existence (i.e., what people have hitherto taken to be real) and what is in fact real — just as in Philippi, according to our suggestion, the accusers claim that while Paul and Silas are apparently Jews, that which is real and significant about them is not Jewish. For a similar attempt to express the contrast between the verbs in Luke 9,48, note that the King James Version simply renders εἶστιν with the future tense, "shall".

Acts 3,2: "The beggar had been crippled ever since his mother's womb".

Acts 5,4: "Even after being sold, the land (i.e., its value) remained in your power, as previously".

Acts 8,16: "Up until then (οὐδέπω)... they had only been baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus".

Acts 17,27: "They should seek the Lord and find Him, although He has all the time not been far from anyone".

2. The Accusers

Having thus concluded that the accusation was that Paul and Silas, although Jewish, were teaching practices forbidden to Romans, namely Christianity, it remains to ask whether this interpretation of the charge carries any implications regarding the identity of the accusers. It is usually assumed, as indicated above, that they were Gentiles. This seems to rest upon three considerations: they denounce as unlawful the practices taught by Jewish missionaries; they call themselves Romans; and they own and profit from a slave possessed by a "python spirit". However, we have rejected the interpretation which underpins the first consideration; Jews could be Roman citizens⁽²⁵⁾ and the picture of Jews claiming to be loyal Romans is usual in Luke-Acts⁽²⁶⁾; and there is no reason, at least from the point of view of Acts, why the owners of such a slave girl might not have been Jewish⁽²⁷⁾. Indeed, as Paul and Silas are apparently portrayed as preaching daily at the Jewish place of prayer, and as meeting the girl there daily, one might just as well suppose that her masters were there too — i.e. that they were Jewish. Furthermore, the accusers state that Paul and Silas were teaching *them* practices which it was unlawful for them to accept; but as far as we see their teaching was confined to the Jews of Philippi⁽²⁸⁾.

Be all that as it may, it seems that our interpretation of Ἰουδαῖοι ὑπάρχοντες as concessive favors the conclusion that the accusers are to be thought of as Jews. If, indeed, these words were a general preface to the accusation (as generally understood), it would be natural to find them on non-Jewish lips; but if they are in fact a concession in spite of which the accusation is made, it is more natural to ascribe them to Jews: while they must admit that

⁽²⁵⁾ For the evidence from Acts and elsewhere, see E. SCHÜRER, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesus Christi*, III (Leipzig 1909) 127-131; J. JUSTER, *Les Juifs dans l'empire romain*, II (Paris 1914) 15-17. For particular problems of Paul's and Silas' Roman citizenship as reflected in the Philippi account, see L. WENGER, "Über erste Berührungen des Christentums mit dem römischen Rechte", *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*, V (Studi e Testi 125; Vatican City 1946) 580-582.

⁽²⁶⁾ See above, n. 2.

⁽²⁷⁾ Compare Jewish involvement with sorcery in Acts 13,6 and 19,13.

⁽²⁸⁾ See Acts 16,13.16; VAN UNNIK, *Mullus*, 368-369 = *Sparsa Collecta*, 378. For the general confinement of Paul's preaching to Jewish audiences (and those who associated themselves with the Jewish community), see GEORGE, "Israël", 513-514; FREND, *Martyrdom*, 157-158.

the accused are Jews, they specify that they are teaching non-Jewish and anti-Roman practices. Such a demonstrative Jewish self-distancing from fellow Jews who are now Christians is just what we would expect from Luke-Acts⁽²⁹⁾.

In summary, therefore, we would suggest translating Acts 16,20-21 as follows: "And they brought them to the magistrates, saying: 'These men are upsetting our city, although they are Jews, and are teaching practices which it is unlawful for us to accept or to do, being Romans'"⁽³⁰⁾. The logic of the accusation, submissive Jewish admission that certain practices are forbidden to Jews because they are forbidden to Romans, is exactly parallel to that meant to be implied by the accusation before Gallio, where Paul is said to have encouraged Jews to worship God contrary to "the law" (Acts 18,13); but there the Jewish accusers left the accusation ambiguous, not specifying which law they meant, and the wise governor, as opposed to the hasty magistrates of Philippi, threw them out of court⁽³¹⁾.

In a note to his dissertation on Paul's sermon in Pisidian Antioch, M. F.-J. Buss points to Acts 3,23 as evidence for Luke's concern to indicate the early rejection of Christianity by the Jews. He continues, however, to remark that "Man kann indessen Lukas nicht vorwerfen, dass er alle Fehlschläge systematisch den Juden anlastete; vgl. Apg 16,19-24; 17,32; 19,23"⁽³²⁾. Now while the second reference alludes to the merely skeptical response to Paul's speech in Athens, the first and third refer to real persecution in Philippi and Ephesus; as we have seen, the former probably refers to Jewish accusers alone, and the latter, however the Alexander incident is to be explained, apparently includes a hostile portrayal of the Jews (although they are not the prime movers). Whether one agrees that that is to be construed as a "Vorwurf" against Luke depends, of course, on his point of view, but it does in any case appear that Luke was even more systematic, in this regard, than is generally conceded.

Department of Jewish History
Hebrew University
Jerusalem
Israel

Daniel R. SCHWARTZ

⁽²⁹⁾ See above, notes 1-2.

⁽³⁰⁾ For smoother English style, one might consider moving "although they are Jews" to the head of the accusation or to just after "these men" (as in the King James Version and the RSV) or to just after "and"; one might also prefer to render the opening *kai* of verse 21 with "for".

⁽³¹⁾ On the ambiguity of this accusation, see especially CONZELMANN, *Apostelgeschichte*, 115-116.

⁽³²⁾ M. F.-J. BUSS, *Die Missionspredigt des Apostels Paulus im Pisidischen Antiochien* (FzB 38; Stuttgart 1980) 144, n. 16.

Zu πληροφορεῖσθαι in Röm 14,5

Eine vom heutigen Konsens abweichende Deutung von πληροφορεῖσθαι in Röm 14,5, die ich in *Verbum Domini* 45 (1967) 11-18, vorgelegt habe, wird sowohl im Römerbriefkommentar von E. Käsemann (z. St.) als auch von H. Hübner, in: *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* (hrsg. von H. Balz/G. Schneider), Bd. III, 1983, 256, unzutreffend wiedergegeben. An die Stelle der durch Röm 4,21 und 14,22f irreführenden Deutung "überzeugt sein" setze ich keineswegs, wie Käsemann und Hübner behaupten, die Deutung "sich (auf seine Meinung) etwas zugute halten, suis placitis indulgere, suo sensui permitti", obwohl diese Sentenz einmal hoch in Ehren stand; ich entscheide mich vielmehr für eine dritte Sentenz, die πληροφορεῖσθαι an dieser Stelle als gleichbedeutend mit dem bekannten paulinischen περισσεύειν betrachtet. Daß beide Autoren dies nicht bemerkt haben, ist umso schwerer verständlich, als mein Beitrag ganz auf den Nachweis dieser Sentenz abgestellt ist. Erfahrungsgemäß wird ein Vorschlag, der in einem führenden Kommentar und in einem Wörterbuch abgelehnt worden ist, keine Beachtung mehr finden. Wer jedoch die Mühe nicht scheut, den in lateinischer Sprache abgefaßten Artikel zu lesen, sollte neu prüfen, ob die lateinische Übersetzung mit "Unusquisque in suo sensu abundet" nicht doch das Richtige getroffen hat.

Pater Damiaanstraat 38
6369 SV Simpelveld
Niederlande

Joachim BECKER

Les leçons des versions géorgiennes de l'épître de Jacques

Dans une étude consacrée aux divisions anciennes de Jc⁽¹⁾, nous avons montré l'importance considérable du témoignage du vieux lectionnaire géorgien⁽²⁾ qui atteste un système de division peu fréquent, mais convenant le mieux au texte, ce qui nous a amené à le considérer comme une trace de la composition primitive de l'œuvre, conservée à travers la liturgie de Jérusalem. Partant de là, nous nous sommes intéressés aux variantes des versions orientales de Jc. Nous avons présenté, ici⁽³⁾, le résultat de l'examen de la version syriaque harklénne (sy^h), en insistant sur son étroite parenté avec un groupe de manuscrits grecs médiévaux, le gr. 2138, qui rassemble les plus sûrs témoins du «texte occidental» de Jc et des autres épîtres catholiques. Les versions géorgiennes ont à leur tour un grand intérêt: tandis que les recensions athonites (geo^c et geo^p) sont assez proches textuellement du type de texte *K* dit «syro-byzantin», la vieille géorgienne, par certains accords avec des témoins grecs, nous amène à poser un 4^e type de texte⁽⁴⁾. Avant de présenter ce type, nous procédons à l'examen des accords des divers témoins, en groupant les lieux variants, de manière à situer avec une précision croissante la place de la vieille géorgienne dans la tradition textuelle de Jc⁽⁵⁾.

(1) C.-B. AMPHOUX, «Systèmes anciens de division et composition littéraire de l'Épître de Jacques», *Bib* 62 (1981) 390-400. L'extraordinaire conservatisme de certains documents bibliques orientaux, parmi lesquels le lectionnaire de K'ala (B, dans le présent article), apparaît, dans cette étude, et donne au géorgien une place exceptionnelle, dans la recherche de l'état premier du texte de l'Ep. de Jc. Pour aller plus loin, il fallait consulter chaque manuscrit et réunir leurs variantes. C'est le travail qu'a fait B. Outtier. C. Amphoux, pour sa part, est responsable de la rédaction et des hypothèses concernant l'histoire du texte et le sens de l'épître.

(2) Il s'agit du Grand Lectionnaire géorgien de l'Église de Jérusalem, d'après l'édition qu'en présente M. Tarnischvili dans le C.S.C.O. (t. 188-189 et 204-205).

(3) C.-B. AMPHOUX, «La parenté textuelle de la sy^h et du gr. 2138 dans l'Épître de Jacques», *Bib* 62 (1981) 259-271.

(4) Les deux principaux types de texte sont désignés commodément par les lettres *H* et *K*; leur qualité, respective, d'«alexandrin» et de «syro-byzantin» doit être considérée avec prudence pour les Épîtres Catholiques et nous mettons ces adjectifs entre guillemets. Le «texte occidental», bien que très divers et contenant plusieurs types, est assimilé, pour la commodité de l'exposé, à un troisième type de texte.

(5) La documentation dont nous avons disposé est complète: La vieille version géorgienne a été étudiée (par B. Outtier) d'après les microfilms et/ou originaux de:

1. Les versions géorgiennes et les leçons où $H = K$.

Il existe, dans Jc, un nombre important de lieux variants où les types de texte H et K s'accordent entre eux; notamment lorsqu'ils attestent la même leçon contre le «texte occidental», représenté d'une part par le gr. 2138 et la sy^h et, d'autre part, par la vieille latine⁽⁶⁾. Dans cette première étape, le choix des lieux répond à deux critères: d'une part, que la différence entre les leçons d'un même lieu variant soit exprimable en géorgien; d'autre part, que les principaux types de texte grecs H et K aient la même leçon. L'objectif est donc, d'abord, de situer la vieille géorgienne par rapport à ces deux types de texte: s'accorde-t-elle plus souvent avec eux, ou contre eux?

Voici les lieux que nous avons relevés:

- 1,11 a) τὸ ἄνθος + αὐτοῦ, $H K$, geo^{BLV}, geo^{C D};
 b) τὸ ἄνθος, gr. 2138-sy^h, geo^{AMNOE};
 1,17 a) τροπῆς ἀποσκίασμα, $H^{pt} K$, geo^{omnes};
 b) τροπὴ ἀποσκίασματος, gr. 2138, it^{ff};
 1,18 a) ἀπεκύησεν, $H K$, geo^{eteri};
 b) ἐποίησεν, gr. 2138-sy^h, geo^G;

- A : Tbilissi S-407, X^e siècle, Praxapostolos, Ep. Cath.; lacuneux: Jc 1,1-25a.
 V : Ivron géorg. 42, entre 959-969, Praxap. Ep. Cath.; complet. Révisé; un texte de ce type a servi de base aux révisions athonites CD (XI^e siècle).
 M : Sinaï géorg. 39 (974): Actes, Ep. Cath.; complet.
 N : Sinaï géorg. 31 (977) Praxap., Ep. Cath.; lacuneux: Jc 1,1-2.14a.
 O : Léningrad (ex-Sinaï géorg. 81) (979), Praxap., Ep. Cath.; complet. Copie du modèle de M?
 B : Lectionnaire de K'ala, Tbilissi, Bibliothèque publique, actuellement en dépôt à l'Institut des manuscrits, X^e siècle; manquent Jc 3,14-18 et 4,11-5,20.
 L : Lectionnaire de Latal, Mestia, X^e siècle; manquent: Jc 2,23b-26; 3,17b-18; 5,4-6 et 16b-20.
 E : Sinaï géorg. 54, X^e siècle, Extraits du Lectionnaire; manquent: 1,13-19a; 2,6-13; 1,24-5,20.
 P : Paris, B.N. géorg. 3, X-XI^e siècle, Lectionnaire; manquent: 1,1-27; 2,5-3,18; 5,12-20.
 La révision C, accomplie par Georges l'Athonite (+ 1065), est étudiée d'après les manuscrits:
 E : Tbilissi, A-584 (1083), Praxapost., Ep. Cath.
 F : Tbilissi, A-34 (XIII^e), Praxapost., Ep. Cath.
 I : Tbilissi, A-141 (XI^e siècle), Praxapost., Ep. Cath.
 La révision D, accomplie sur C par Ephrem Mtsiré (+ vers 1100):
 G : Tbilissi, A-137 (XIV^e), (corrigé selon C!) Praxap., Ep. Cath.
 H : Tbilissi, H-677 (XII^e), Praxap., Ep. Cath.
 J : Léningrad, Institut d'orientalisme, K-4 (XIII^e siècle), Praxap., Ep. Cath.
 N.B. Dans l'édition de B, l'éditrice a plus d'une fois complété le texte, fragmentaire, par des leçons d'autres recensions: on ne peut s'y fier avec certitude.

⁽⁶⁾ Dans l'édition de Beuron (*Vetus Latina*, vol. 26/1 fasc. 1, ed. W. THIELE, [Freiburg-im-B. 1956]), les principaux témoins «occidentaux» sont les mss 66,67 et les cit. du Speculum (Ps-AU spe): dans les ed. courantes du NT, les témoins sont désignés respectivement par les sigles (it) ff 1 m. Les 2 derniers sont fragmentaires pour Jc. A noter qu'à la différence de 1 Pi, on est démuné pour Jc de cit. de Tertullien et de Cyprien.

- 1,21 a) τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν, *H K*, geo^{eteri};
 b) τὰς ψυχὰς ἡμῶν, gr. 307 al., lat^{cit}, bo^{ms}, geo^L(?);
- 1,22 a) μὴ μόνον ἀκροαταί, *H K*, geo^{ALEV}, geo^{C D};
 b) μὴ ἀκροαταὶ μόνον, B03, gr. 2138-sy^h, geo^B;
- 1,24 a) κατενόησεν γάρ, *H K*, geo^{omnes}, sy^{hmg};
 b) κατενόησεν δέ, gr. 2138-sy^h(^{txt});
- 1,27 a) τῷ θεῷ + καὶ (τῷ) πατρί, (*H*) *K*, geo^{omnes};
 b) τῷ θεῷ, gr. 2138, it^{ff};
- 1,27 a) ἀσπίλον ἑαυτὸν τηρεῖν, *H K*, geo^{omnes};
 b) ἀσπίλους ἑαυτοὺς τηρεῖτε, gr. 2138-sy^h;
- 2,1 a) τοῦ κυρίου... τῆς δόξης, *H K*, geo^{omnes};
 b) τοῦ κυρίου τῆς δόξης..., gr. 2138-sy^h;
- 2,3 a) ὑπὸ τὸ ὑποπόδιον, *H K*, geo^{omnes};
 b) ἐπὶ τὸ ὑποπόδιον, Ψ044, 1739, gr. 2138-sy^h;
- 2,5 a) ἀκούσατε, ἀδελφοί μου, *H K*, geo^{omnes}, sy^h;
 b) ἀκούσατέ μου, ἀδελφοί, gr. 2138, (arm);
- 2,5 a) ἐπηγγείλατο, *H K*, geo^{C D};
 b) ἐπηγγείλατο + ὁ θεός, gr. 2138-sy^h, geo^{MNOBLEV};
- 2,7 a) οὐκ αὐτοί, *H K*, geo^{omnes};
 b) καὶ αὐτοί, gr. 2138-sy^h;
- 2,11 a) μοιχευσ-... φονευσ-, *H K*, geo^{omnes};
 b) φονευσ-... μοιχευσ-, gr. 2138-sy^h;
- 2,23 a) φίλος θεοῦ, *H K*, geo^{MOEV}, geo^{C D}, sy^{hmg};
 b) δοῦλος θεοῦ, gr. 2138-sy^h(^{txt});
- 3,11 a) γλυκύ... πικρόν, *H K*, geo^{MOBLV}, geo^{C D};
 b) πικρόν... γλυκύ, gr. 2138;
- 4,4 a) ὃς ἐάν + οὖν, *H K*, geo^{C D};
 b) ὃς ἐάν, gr. 2138, geo^{MOBLPV};
- 4,8 a) ἀγνίσατε, *H K*, geo^{C D} (geo^{MOBLPV} = arm: «rectos-facite»);
 b) ἀγιάσατε, gr. 2138-sy^h;
- 4,11 a) ὁ καταλαλῶν, *H K*, geo^{MOLPV}, geo^{C D};
 b) ὁ + γάρ καταλαλῶν, gr. 2138-sy^h;
- 4,16 a) ἐν ταῖς ἀλαζονείαις, *H K*, geo^{MOLPV}, geo^{C D};
 b) ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀλαζονείαις, gr. 2138-sy^h;
- 4,16 a) πᾶσα καύχησις, *H K*, geo^{MOLPV}, geo^{C D};
 b) πᾶσα + οὖν καύχησις, gr. 2138-sy^h;
- 5,8 a) τοῦ κυρίου, *H K*, geo^{LPV(MO)}, geo^{C D};
 b) τοῦ κυρίου + ἡμῶν, gr. 2138-sy^h;

(?) Le gr. 307 contient un certain nombre de minuscules grecs dont la parenté textuelle a été repérée par H. von Soden. Sur le nom que nous lui donnons, cf. C.-B. AMPHOUX, «Les mss grecs de l'Épître de Jacques, d'après une collation de 25 lieux variants», *RHT* 8 (1978) 247-276, et en particulier p. 254. Ce sont des mss à commentaires, héritiers de la Chaîne d'André (cf. R. DEVREESE, «Chaines», *DBSup* t. I [Paris 1928] col. 1224-1228). La citation latine et le témoin copte sont signalés par W. Thiele (op. cit.). Les onciaux grecs sont notés avec lettre majuscule, suivie du chiffre que leur attribue la numérotation de Gregory.

- 5,20 a) / *H K*, *geo*^{VMO}, *geo*^{CD};
 b) ἀμήν, gr. 2138-sy^h.

Sur 23 lieux recensés, la vieille géorgienne s'accorde 17 fois avec *H-K*, 2 fois avec le gr. 2138 contre *H-K*, les autres cas étant partagés, (tandis que la sy^h, pour ces mêmes lieux, s'accorde 18 fois avec le gr. 2138). Autrement dit, en dépit de quelques affinités avec le «texte occidental», dont l'histoire du texte devra tenir compte, la vieille géorgienne s'accorde plutôt avec la grande branche de la tradition grecque, représentée par les leçons communes des types de texte *H* et *K*.

2. Les versions géorgiennes et les leçons où *H* diffère de *K*.

Mais comment se situe la vieille géorgienne à l'intérieur de la grande branche *H-K*?

Il convient, pour le savoir, d'examiner les leçons de *geo* quand *H* et *K* sont en désaccord. Mais cela n'est pas si simple: les minuscules grecs, en général, s'accordent bien entre eux et garantissent l'existence d'un type de texte *K*; en revanche, l'unité du type *H* est beaucoup moins nette, ses témoins ayant entre eux de nombreux désaccords. Nous n'avons donc retenu, dans cette deuxième étape, que les lieux où la plupart des témoins de *H* s'accordent contre *K*. Nous mentionnons les témoins de *H* d'après von Soden, revu et complété d'après G.N.T. (3^e éd.) et Nestle-Aland (26^e éd.)⁽⁸⁾: d'une part, les cinq onciaux B03, S01, C04, A02 et Ψ044; d'autre part, les minuscules 33, 81 et 1175; à ces témoins, qui forment le groupe *H* de von Soden, nous ajoutons le 1739 (du sous-groupe Ib² de von Soden) et ses proches parmi lesquels on notera surtout les mss 945 et 2298⁽⁹⁾; enfin, les papyri, tous très lacuneux pour *Jc*, sont également classés avec *H*. Il arrive, dans les lieux qui suivent, que quelques témoins de *H* ne s'accordent pas avec les autres: nous les faisons figurer à côté de *K*.

Voici cette deuxième série de lieux:

- 1,25 a) οὐκ ἀκροατής, *H*, *geo*^{AMNOBLEV};
 b) + οὗτος οὐκ ἀκροατής, *K*, Ψ044, *geo*^{CD};
 1,26 a) εἶναι, *H*, *geo*^{MNOBLEV};
 b) εἶναι + ἐν ὑμῖν, *K*, *geo*^{CD};
 2,3 a) εἴπητε, *H*, *geo*^{MNOLV};
 b) εἴπητε + αὐτῷ, *K*, gr. 1739, *geo*^{BE}, *geo*^{CD};
 2,4 a) (οὐ) διεκρίθητε, *H*, *geo*^{MNOBLEPV};
 b) + καὶ (οὐ) διεκρίθητε, *K*, *geo*^{CD};
 2,5 a) τῷ κόσμῳ, *H*, 1739, *geo*^B («ex mundo»);
 b) τοῦ κόσμου, *K*, Ψ044, 33, *geo*^{MNOLEV}, *geo*^{CD};

⁽⁸⁾ K. ALAND - M. BLACK - C. MARTINI - B. METZGER - A. WIKGREN, *The Greek New Testament* (U.B.S.; London - Amsterdam - Stuttgart 1975); NESTLE - ALAND *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Stuttgart 26^e 1979).

⁽⁹⁾ Quand 1739 s'accorde avec plusieurs mss proches de lui, nous notons «gr. 1739».

- 2,17 a) *μη ἔχη ἔργα*, *H*, *geo^{C D}* (*geo^{MOBLEV}*: autre ordre des mots);
 b) *μη ἔργα ἔχη*, *K*, 81, 1739;
- 2,18 a) *χωρίς*, *H*, *geo^{MOBLEV}*;
 b) *ἐκ*, *K*, *geo^{C D}*;
- 2,18 a) *τῶν ἔργων*, *H*, *geo^{EV}*;
 b) *τῶν ἔργων + σου*, *K*, C04, Ψ044, 1175, *geo^{MOBL}*, *geo^{C D}*;
- 2,18 a) *τὴν πίστιν²*, *H*, *geo^{MOBLEV}*;
 b) *τὴν πίστιν + μου*, *K*, A02, Ψ044, *geo^{C D}*;
- 2,24 a) *ὁρᾶτε*, *H*, *geo^V*, *geo^{C D}*;
 b) *ὁρᾶτε τοίνυν*, *K*, *geo^{MO}*;
- 3,6 a) *ἡ γλῶσσα*, *H*;
 b) *+ οὕτως ἡ γλῶσσα*, *K*, 33, *geo^{MOLV(B)}*, *geo^{C D}*;
- 3,9 a) *τὸν κύριον*, *H*;
 b) *τὸν θεόν*, *K*, *geo^{MOBLV}*, *geo^{C D}*;
- 3,12 a) *ἀλυκόν*, *H*, *geo^{MOBLV}*;
 b) *+ μιὰ πηγὴ ἀλυκόν*, *K*, *geo^{C D}*;
- 3,12 a) *γλυκύ*, *H*, *geo^{MOBLV}*;
 b) *+ καὶ γλυκύ*, *K*, *geo^{C D}*;
- 3,17 a) *ἀνυπόκριτος*, *H*, *geo^{MOV}*;
 b) *+ καὶ ἀνυπόκριτος*, *K*, *geo^{C D}*;
- 4,1 a) *+ πόθεν μάχαι*, *H*, *geo^{LPV}*;
 b) *μάχαι*, *K*, *geo^{MO}*, *geo^{C D}*;
- 4,4 a) *μοιχαλίδες*, *H*, *geo^{MOLV}*;
 b) *+ μοιχοὶ καὶ μοιχαλίδες*, *K*, Ψ044, *geo^{C D}*;
- 4,11 a) *ἡ κρίνων*, *H*, *geo^{MOLPV}*;
 b) *καὶ κρίνων*, *K*, *geo^{C D}*;
- 4,12 a) *νομοθέτης + καὶ κριτῆς*, *H*, *geo^{MOPV}*, *geo^{C D}*;
 b) *νομοθέτης*, *K*, P74;
- 4,12 a) *πλησίον*, *H*, *geo^{MOLPV}*, *geo^{C D}*;
 b) *ἔτερον*, *K*;
- 4,13 a) *ἡ αὖριον*, *H*, *geo^{MOLPV}*, *geo^{C D}*;
 b) *καὶ αὖριον*, *K*, A02;
- 5,5 a) *ἐν ἡμέρᾳ*, *H*, *geo^{P(?)}*;
 b) *+ ὥς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ*, *K*, Ψ044, 81, 1175, *geo^{MOV}*, *geo^{C D}*;
- 5,9 a) *ἀδελφοί μου, ἀλλήλων*, *H*, *geo^{MOPV}*; (*geo^{C D}*);
 b) *ἀλλήλων, ἀδελφοί μου*, *K*, S01;
- 5,10 a) *ἀδελφοί*, *H*;
 b) *ἀδελφοί + μου*, *K*, S01, *geo^{MOLPV}*, *geo^{C D}*;
- 5,11 a) *ἐστὶν + ὁ κύριος*, *H*, *geo^{MOLPV}*;
 b) *ἐστὶν*, *K*, *geo^{C D}*;
- 5,12 a) *ὑπὸ κρίσιν*, *H*;
 b) *εἰς ὑπόκρισιν*, *K*, *geo^{MOLV}*, *geo^{C D}*;
- 5,16 a) *ἐξομολογεῖσθε + οὖν*, *H*;
 b) *ἐξομολογεῖσθε*, *K*, *geo^{MOLV}*, *geo^{C D}*;
- 5,19 a) *ἀδελφοί + μου*, *H*, *geo^{MOV}*;
 b) *ἀδελφοί*, *K*, *geo^{C D}*;
- 5,20 a) *ψυχὴν + αὐτοῦ*, *H*, *geo^V*, *geo^{C D}*;
 b) *ψυχὴν*, *K*, *geo^{MO}*.

Sur 29 lieux rassemblés dans cette deuxième liste, la vieille géorgienne s'accorde plus souvent avec le type de texte *H* qu'avec *K*⁽¹⁰⁾. La proportion de deux accords avec *H* pour un avec *K* nous amène à considérer les versions les plus anciennes comme un assez bon témoin du type de texte *H*. En revanche, à quelques exceptions près, les révisions athonites CD (XI^e siècle) s'accordent avec *K*. L'étape suivante confirme ce classement et permet de situer plus précisément encore la vieille géorgienne à l'intérieur du type de texte *H*.

3. La vieille géorgienne et les leçons qui divisent *H*.

Dans une trentaine de lieux variants de *Jc*, on peut constater un groupement de témoins, autour des onciaux anciens, se distinguant de la masse des minuscules grecs — et pour des leçons dont les nuances sont sensibles en géorgien. C'est ce que nous avons appelé *H*. Mais, dans un nombre de lieux au moins équivalent, on constate que ce groupement ne s'opère pas, qu'il y a, au contraire, un éclatement de ces témoins en diverses leçons, parmi lesquelles peut se trouver la leçon *K*. Et c'est dans cette troisième tranche de variantes que la vieille géorgienne présente les apparentements les plus intéressants pour l'histoire du texte. Nous donnons d'abord une liste de lieux où les témoins de *H* se dispersent en deux ou trois leçons; puis nous reviendrons sur un apparentement particulièrement fréquent de la vieille géorgienne.

- 1,12 a) ἐπηγγείλατο, P²³, B03 S01 A02 Ψ044, al., geo^{MNO};
 b) ἐπηγγείλατο ὁ θεός, gr. 1739, geo^{ABLEV}, geo^{C D};
 ἐπηγγείλατο ὁ κύριος, *K*, (C04);
- 1,19 a) ἴστε, B03 C04, 1739, geo^{AMNOBLV}, sy^{hmg};
 b) ἴστε + δέ, P⁷⁴(?), A02, sa;
 c) ἴστω, S01*;
 d) ὦστε, *K*, Ψ044;
- 2,3 a) στῆθι + ἐκεῖ, *K*, S01, C04 A02, Ψ044, al., geo^{MNOLEPV}, geo^{C D};
 b) στῆθι, B03, gr. 1739, geo^B;
- 2,3 a) κάθου, C04 A02, Ψ044, al., geo^{MNOBLEPV};
 b) κάθου ἐκεῖ, B03, gr. 1739;
 c) κάθου ὧδε, *K*, P⁷⁴(?), S01, sa, geo^{C D};
- 2,4 a) + οὐ διεκρίθητε, S01, C04 A02, Ψ044, al., 1739, geo^{C D};
 b) διεκρίθητε, B03, geo^{MNOBLEPV};
- 2,10 a) τηρήση (-σει), (*K*), B03 S01, C04, al., geo^{C D};
 b) τελέσει, Ψ044, al., gr. 1739, geo^{MNOBLV};
 c) πληρώσει, A02, gr. 2138-sy^h(¹¹);
- 2,13 a) κατακαυχᾶται, *K*, B03 S01, Ψ044, geo^{D(H)^C};
 b) κατακαυχᾶσθε, C04²(*), 1739*, geo^{MNOBV}, geo^{C D(G)};

(¹⁰) Pour les chapitres 1 à 3, attestés par geo^B, geo s'accorde 7 fois avec *H*, 4 fois avec *K*; pour les chapitres 4 et 5, geo s'accorde 8 fois avec *H* et 4 avec *K*.

(¹¹) Geo et sy^h emploient ici le même mot qu'en 2,8 (τελεῖτε); ils pourraient donc l'un et l'autre traduire τελεῖτε mais on ne peut être certain que sy^h n'a pas la même leçon que le gr. 2138.

- c) κατακαυχάσθω, A02, al., gr. 1739;
 2,15 a) εἰς ἐάν, B03 S01, al., gr. 1739, geo^{MOBLE};
 b) ἐάν δέ, K, C04 A02, Ψ044, geo^{D(G)};
 c) ἐάν γάρ, geo^{C D(HJ)};
 2,15 a) λειπόμενοι, B03 S01, al., geo^{omnes};
 b) λειπόμενοι + ὧσιν, K, A02, Ψ044, al., gr. 1739;
 2,19 a) εἷς ἐστὶν (ὁ) θεός, (P⁷⁴, S01, A02), (Ψ044), 1739, geo^{omnes};
 b) εἷς (ὁ) θεός ἐστὶν, B03, (C04, al.), gr. 2138-sy^h;
 c) ὁ θεὸς εἷς ἐστὶν, K⁽¹²⁾;
 2,20 a) ἀργή ἐστὶν, B03, C04*, gr. 1739, geo^{MOLV};
 b) νεκρά ἐστὶν, K, S01, A02, Ψ044, geo^{BE}, geo^{C D};
 2,25 a) ἀγγέλους, K, B03 S01, A02, Ψ044, al.;
 b) κατασκόπους, C04, gr. 1739, geo^{omnes}, sy^h;
 3,3 a) αὐτοὺς ἡμῖν, K, B03 S01, al.;
 b) ἡμῖν αὐτούς, C04 A02, Ψ044, al., gr. 1739, geo^V, geo^{C D};
 c) ἡμῖν, geo^{MOBL};
 3,4 a) ἀνέμων σκληρῶν, B03 S01, C04, al.;
 b) σκληρῶν ἀνέμων, K, A02, Ψ044, al., gr. 1739, geo^{omnes};
 3,5 a) ἡλίκον πῦρ, B03 S01, al.;
 b) ὀλίγον πῦρ, K, C04* A02*(?), Ψ044, al., gr. 1739, geo^{omnes};
 3,7 a) δαμάζεται καὶ δεδάμασται, K, B03 S01, A02, al., geo^{omnes};
 b) δεδάμασται καὶ δαμάζεται, P²⁰, C04, gr. 1739;
 3,8 a) δύναται δαμάσαι ἀνθρώπων, S01, A02, Ψ044, al.;
 b) δαμάσαι δύναται ἀνθρώπων, P²⁰, B03, C04, gr. 1739, geo^{MO};
 c) δύναται ἀνθρώπων δαμάσαι, K, geo^{B(?)};
 d) ἀνθρώπων δύναται δαμάσαι, geo^{VL}, geo^{C D};
 3,8 a) ἀκατάστατον, B03 S01, A02, 1739^c, geo^L;
 b) ἀκατάσχετον, K, C04, Ψ044, al., 1739^{c2}, geo^{MOV}, geo^{C D(13)};
 3,12 a) οὔτε, B03, C04 A02, al.;
 b) οὕτως οὐδέ, (K), S01, 1739, geo^{omnes};
 3,15 a) αὕτη ἡ σοφία, K, B03, S01, A02, Ψ044, al., geo^{omnes};
 b) ἡ σοφία αὕτη, C04, gr. 1739, gr. 2138-sy^h;
 3,17 a) καρπῶν ἐργῶν ἀγαθῶν, C04, gr. 1739, geo^{omnes};
 b) καρπῶν ἀγαθῶν, K, B03 S01, A02, Ψ044, al.;
 4,1 a) καὶ μάχαι ἐν ὑμῖν, K, B03 S01, C04, gr. 1739, geo^{C D};
 b) ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ μάχαι, A02, Ψ044, geo^{MOBLPV};
 4,2 a) οὐκ ἔχετε², K, B03, C04 A02, al., 1739;
 b) καὶ οὐκ ἔχετε, S01, Ψ044, al., geo^{omnes(14)};

(12) Les témoins entre parenthèses de ce lieu ont ὁ devant θεός; sauf Ψ044, qui a ἐστὶν θεός, sans εἷς; d'où la parenthèse séparée.

(13) 1739* donne -σταχτον, corrigé, d'après K. LAKE et S. NEW, *Six Collations of NT Mss* (Cambridge 1932) 161, par le copiste lui-même en -στατον, puis surchargé en -σχετον également par le copiste, mais de manière à donner, cette fois, une autre variante; l'accord C04-1739-geo n'est donc pas assuré pour ce lieu, mais on ne peut l'exclure.

(14) Après ce lieu, C04 est lacuneux jusqu'à la fin de Jc.

- 4,14 a) ποία γὰρ ἡ ζωή, K, P⁷⁴, A02, Ψ044, gr. 1739, geo^{MOV}, geo^{C D};
 b) ποία ἡ ζωή, B03 S01*, gr. 2138-sy^h, geo^{LP};
 4,14 a) (ἀτμῖς) ἔστε, B03, al., gr. 1739, geo^{omnes};
 b) ἔστιν, L020, al.;
 c) ἔσται, K, A02, Ψ044;
 5,7 a) λάβη, P⁷⁴, B03, al., gr. 1739, geo^{ceteri};
 b) λάβη καρπὸν, S01(*), sy^{hmg};
 c) λάβη ὑετόν, K, A02, Ψ044, gr. 2138-sy^{h(txt)}, geo^{C(I)};
 5,16 a) τὰς ἀμαρτίας, (K), B03 S01, A02, Ψ044, al., geo^{omnes};
 b) τὰς ἀμαρτίας ὑμῶν, gr. 1739, gr. 2138-sy^h;
 5,18 a) ὑετόν ἔδωκεν, K, B03, al., geo^{MO};
 b) ἔδωκεν ὑετόν, S01, A02, Ψ044, al., gr. 1739, geo^V, geo^{C D};
 5,19 a) ἀπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας, K, B03, A02, Ψ044, gr. 1739, geo^{C D};
 b) ἀπὸ τῆς ὁδοῦ τῆς ἀληθείας, S01, al., geo^{MOV}.

Pris globalement, ces lieux ne permettent pas d'apprécier exactement la place de la vieille géo dans le type de texte *H*; les lieux sont d'une valeur inégale, pour en juger. La vieille géo, en outre, n'a pas la même qualité d'attestation d'un bout à l'autre de Jc. Ces lieux offrent, du moins, un cadre dans lequel on pourra situer les leçons suivantes, pour lesquelles nous notons, cette fois, comme base de comparaison, les autres versions anciennes dont nous avons pu disposer:

- 1) 1,12 ἐπηγγέλατο ὁ θεός, gr. 1739, geo^{ABLEV}, geo^{C D}, vg, sy^p, eth;
- 2) 1,19 ἴσθε, B03, C04, 1739, geo^{AMNOBLV}, sy^{hmg}, it, vg, bo, arm;
- 3) 2,3 στήθι (- ἐκεῖ), B03, gr. 1739, geo^B, it^{ff}, sa;
- 4) 2,10 τελέσει, Ψ044, al., gr. 1739, geo^{MNOBLV};
- 5) 2,13 καυχᾶσθε, C04, 1739*, geo^{MNOBV}, geo^{C D(X)};
- 6) 2,19 εἰς ἔστιν θεός, 1739, geo^{omnes}, vg, (sa, bo, sy^p, arm, eth);
- 7) 2,20 ἀργή, B03, C04*, gr. 1739, geo^{MOLV}, vg, sa, (it^{ff}, arm: «vacua»);
- 8) 2,25 κατασκοπούς, C04, gr. 1739, geo^{omnes}, sy^{hmg}, it^{ff}, sa, bo, sy^p, arm, eth;
- 9) 3,7 δεδάμασται καὶ δαμάζεται, P²⁰, C04, gr. 1739, arm;
- 10) 3,8 δαμάσαι δύναται ἀνθρώπων, P²⁰, B03, C04, gr. 1739, geo^{MO}, sy^h;
- 11) 3,12 οὕτως οὐδὲ (- μιὰ πηγὴ), S01, 1739, geo^{omnes}, it^{ff}, vg, bo, (sy^p);
- 12) 3,17 καρπὼν ἔργων, C04, gr. 1739, geo^{omnes};
- 13) 4,14 ἀτμῖς γὰρ ἔστε, B03, al., gr. 1739, geo^{omnes}, it^{Hil}, eth, sy^h, arm.

Ces 13 leçons ont en commun de n'appartenir à aucun des deux principaux types de texte; aucune n'est attestée, non plus, par gr. 2138-sy^h; on y trouve des additions, omissions, substitutions et interventions de mots occupant une fonction grammaticale importante. Les attestations comportent presque toujours trois témoins: geo (12 fois), gr. 1739 ou ms 1739 (13 fois) et C04 (7 fois). Aucune des versions consultées n'a plus de six leçons, sur les 13; parmi les autres témoins grecs, B03 est plus fréquemment cité: il n'a que cinq leçons, P²⁰, deux, S01 et Ψ044, une. Dans six des treize lieux variants, B03 et S01 ont la même leçon contre C04 (4 fois), geo (7 fois) et 1739 (6 fois), et la question se pose, pour ces six lieux au moins, de savoir laquelle des deux leçons a des chances d'être plus ancienne que l'autre. Le témoignage de P²⁰,

du III^e siècle, ne vaut que pour l'une de ces leçons; il suffit à montrer que C04 et 1739 ont pu conserver des leçons anciennes, même contre l'accord B03-S01; et par conséquent, la vieille géo, qui a un accord privilégié avec ces deux témoins, à l'intérieur du type de texte *H*, pourrait bien, elle aussi, attester certaines leçons très anciennes, peut-être primitives, mais reléguées aujourd'hui dans l'apparat critique (au mieux), sur la foi du témoignage de B03 et S01, dont l'accord domine largement le texte que nous lisons.

Ainsi, l'accord gr. 1739-geo, 12 fois attesté dans ces 13 leçons, 17 fois réalisé dans les 29 lieux précédents, est pour nous une donnée importante: moins constant que l'accord gr. 2138-sy^h, il se répète en des lieux où le hasard ne suffit pas à tout expliquer. En particulier, quand gr. 1739-geo s'accorde à la fois contre B03-S01 et *K*, ne faut-il pas supposer qu'ils sont les descendants plus ou moins lointains d'une même tradition ancienne du texte, distincte de celle de B03 et S01? Partant de cette question, nous avons songé à distinguer, dans *H*, deux sous-groupes, voire deux types de textes, taxinomiquement très proches, mais historiquement distincts:

- a) C04, gr. 1739, geo;
- b) B03, S01, A02, Ψ044 al.

4. Un détour par la Première Épître de Pierre.

On retrouve des accords privilégiés entre C04, gr. 1739 et geo dans 1 Pi, et probablement dans d'autres épîtres catholiques; mais l'intérêt de 1 Pi est d'être aussi entièrement conservée dans un papyrus ancien, P⁷² (Bodmer VII-IX, copié au IV^e siècle, mais conservant un état du texte plus ancien, probablement de la fin du III^e siècle. Or, en quatorze lieux où P⁷² atteste une leçon différente de B03-S01, il s'accorde généralement avec 1739, C04 et geo, contre B03-S01. Voici ces lieux⁽¹⁵⁾:

a) 12 accords P⁷²-C04 (chap. 1-3)-gr. 1739-geo (quand on peut déduire la leçon grecque traduite):

- 1,6 a) δέον ἐστί, P⁷², C04, gr. 1739, geo, (=K);
- b) δέον, B03 S01;
- 1,16 a) ἄγιός ἐμι, P⁷², C04, gr. 1739, geo, (=K);
- b) ἄγιος, B03 S01;
- 2,19 a) συνείδησιν ἀγαθὴν, C04, gr. 1739, geo, al.;
- b) συνείδησιν ἀγαθὴν θεοῦ, P⁷², geo^{C D};
- c) συνείδησιν θεοῦ, B03 S01;
- 2,25 a) πλανώμενα (πρόβατα), P⁷², C04, gr. 1739, geo, (=K);
- b) πλανώμενοι (ἦτε), B03 S01;
- 3,1 a) αἱ γυναῖκες, P⁷², C04, gr. 1739, (=K);
- b) γυναῖκες, B03 S01; (geo indifférent);

(15) L'apparat utilisé est celui de von Soden. Ces lieux ont été choisis, en fonction des accords entre les témoins, après examen des 107 lieux variants principaux de l'Épître, concernant le type de texte *H*. Pour 1 Pi, comme pour Jc, C04 est lacuneux pour les chapitres 4 et 5.

- 3,22 a) τοῦ θεοῦ, P⁷², C04, gr. 1739, (=K);
 b) θεοῦ, B03 S01; (geo indifférent);
- 4,14 a) (ἐπ)αναπέπνυται, (P⁷²), gr. 1739, geo; (C04 lac. 4,5-fin);
 b) ἀναπαύεται, B03 S01, (=K);
- 4,19 a) ἐν ἀγαθοποιίαις, P⁷², gr. 1739, (geo ? l'instrumental est indifférent au nombre);
 b) ἐν ἀγαθοποιίᾳ, B03 S01, (=K);
- 5,2 a) ἐπισκοποῦντες, P⁷², gr. 1739, geo, (=K);
 b) —, B03 S01;
- 5,8 a) ὅτι ὁ ἀντίδικος, P⁷², gr. 1739, geo, al.;
 b) ὁ ἀντίδικος, B03 S01, (=K);
- 5,8 a) τίνα καταπίη, P⁷², gr. 1739, geo, (=K);
 b) τίνα καταπιεῖν, B03 S01(*);
- 5,10 a) ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, P⁷², gr. 1739, geo, (=K);
 b) ἐν χριστῷ, B03 S01.
- b) 2 lieux de désaccord de ces témoins (pour des leçons très proches, formellement, entre elles):
- 2,20 a) ὑπομένετε, P⁷², gr. 1739, al.;
 b) ὑπομενεῖτε, C04, geo, B03 S01;
- 4,15 a) ἀλλότριος ἐπίσκοπος, P⁷², al.;
 b) ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος, gr. 1739, (=K);
 c) ἀλλοτριεπίσκοπος, B03 S01, al.

Le témoignage de P⁷² montre l'ancienneté de certaines leçons du type K, puisqu'elles sont déjà attestées au III^e siècle. Mais il vient également confirmer celle des leçons du gr. 1739 et de C04; et l'on note avec intérêt que geo s'accorde avec ces témoins aussi souvent que la variante est sensible dans cette version, sauf en 2,20, où gr. 1739 et C04 sont séparés.

5. Un type de texte palestinien.

Nous avons jusqu'ici considéré les variantes d'un point de vue taxinomique. Mais sans entrer dans le détail, nous disposons de quelques connaissances sur les manuscrits principaux de ce nouveau groupe, à savoir P⁷², C04, 1739 et geo^B, qui permettent de proposer une localisation géographique, à date ancienne, de leur type de texte. Le ms 1739 (Lavra B'64) contient, dans les marges des épîtres pauliniennes (surtout) de nombreuses références à Origène (cf. K. LAKE-S. NEW, *Six Collations of NT Mss* [Cambridge 1932] 194-219, consacrées aux notes marginales de ce manuscrit). C'est un manuscrit du milieu du X^e siècle, copié à Constantinople; mais on peut supposer que son modèle était d'origine palestinienne. Zuntz pense qu'il faisait partie de la bibliothèque de Césarée (*The text of the Epistles* [London 1952] 73). De son côté, le lectionnaire de K'ala (geo^B) est un précieux témoin de la lecture liturgique à Jérusalem au début du V^e siècle, peut-être avant. Le Codex Ephraemi rescriptus (C04) n'apporte point d'informations utiles pour notre propos; mais le pap. Bodmer VII-IX (P⁷²) conserve un texte de certaines épîtres catholiques et d'autres œuvres qui date au plus tard de la fin du III^e siècle (M. TESTUZ, *Pap. Bodmer VII-IX* [Cologny-Genève 1959] 7-9). Ces données

sont convergentes; elles rendent plausibles que ce type de texte existait en Palestine au III^e siècle. D'autres arrivent à une conclusion semblable; en particulier Muriel M. CARDER, à partir d'un ms. sinaïtique proche du 1739 (Sinaï gr. 262, le minuscule 1243 du NT; cf. «A Cesarean text in the Catholic Epistles?» *NTS* 16 [1969-70] 252-270). Ce type de texte, proche de celui représenté par S01 et B03, s'en distingue cependant de deux manières: certaines variantes, nous venons de le voir, sont différentes; et nous avons déjà montré que les divisions du texte pour l'épître de Jc, impliquaient des lectures différentes de l'œuvre, la plus ancienne étant, selon toute vraisemblance, celle qui va avec les coupes *palestiniennes*, attestées par le lectionnaire de K'ala, et présentes dans le premier système de division du Vaticanus.

Il y a peut-être, dans ces divisions du texte, une clé pour comprendre l'histoire la plus ancienne du texte de l'ép. de Jc. On peut expliquer le passage des divisions palestiniennes aux autres systèmes comme lié à un glissement vers une lecture sapientielle d'une œuvre qui ne l'était pas d'abord; le système attesté en Égypte et celui courant dans les manuscrits byzantins sont indépendants, mais ont sans doute le même point de départ, qui est le système palestinien, avec en particulier les divisions 1,12/13 et 4,10/11⁽¹⁶⁾. De même, le type de texte «syro-byzantin» *K* ne dérive pas du type «alexandrin» représenté par S01 et B03, mais plutôt d'un type intermédiaire, comme l'est justement le type palestinien, souvent très proche de B03 et S01, mais ayant aussi des accords avec *K*, dont P⁷², dans 1 Pi, montre que ce ne sont pas des leçons tardives, introduites après coup dans les témoins du type palestinien.

A ce stade de notre enquête, il est très tentant de voir dans le type de texte palestinien le plus fidèle représentant du texte primitif de Jc. Dans bien des lieux variants, la leçon palestinienne convient aussi bien que l'autre comme variante-source, parfois elle est meilleure, rarement moins bonne. Et les divisions du texte sont assimilables à des lieux variants dont la meilleure variante-source serait palestinienne. Pourtant, une telle hypothèse ne réglerait pas le problème que pose le «texte occidental» dans cette tradition manuscrite⁽¹⁷⁾: ni les leçons de la vieille latine, ni celles du gr. 2138 et de la Syriaque harkléenne ne s'expliquent globalement à partir du texte palestinien. Le type de texte palestinien représente donc un stade dans l'histoire du texte de l'épître; il pourrait être antérieur à la naissance des types «alexandrin» et «syro-byzantin». Mais il ne se confond pas avec la composition de l'œuvre.

La critique externe est impuissante à préciser le rapport entre le type palestinien et le «texte occidental» de Jc. Dans le type palestinien, l'organisation générale de l'œuvre s'est maintenue: l'épître comprend 8 parties méticuleusement construites, mais le sens, le genre littéraire initial se sont déjà perdus; la forme a donc déjà subi quelques transformations significatives. Le «texte occidental» comprend plusieurs types: celui représenté par le gr. 2138 et le sy^h atteste une composition relativement tardive (elle est «syro-byzantine»), mais le texte contient des traces d'un état remarquablement ancien,

⁽¹⁶⁾ Cf. art. cit. n. 1. Ces divisions se retrouvent également en Éthiopie: cf. en particulier Paris, B.N., ms éth. 26 (Zotenberg 42).

⁽¹⁷⁾ Cf. art. cit. n. 2.

antérieur parfois à toutes les autres formes connues. La part très ancienne y est cependant limitée et tout porte à croire qu'au moment de la copie de l'archétype — qui pourrait être du V^e siècle — le sens et le genre littéraire premiers étaient déjà perdus de vue. Par ces deux types de textes, «occidental» et palestinien, on parvient à déceler par endroits le texte primitif, mais celui-ci ne subsiste qu'à l'état de ruines, qu'il est parfois difficile de raccorder avec assurance.

Le résultat de la critique interne est à la fois plus riche, plus subtil et plus prometteur. A assembler les phrases d'une partie, et les parties de l'œuvre entre elles, on prend lentement conscience d'un vaste projet théologique condensé plutôt que développé autour d'un canevas d'une étonnante fermeté⁽¹⁸⁾: les propos sur la loi (2,1-13), la foi (2,14-26), l'enseignement (3,1-18) et le juste devant Dieu (4,1-10) ne se suivent pas dans cet ordre par hasard; ils forment le cœur de l'œuvre, les quatre étapes de l'exégèse scripturaire qui situe Jésus, prédicateur des Béatitudes (1,1-12), nouvel Adam (13-27), par rapport aux grandes figures de la Torah, à savoir Moïse, Abraham, Babel, Noé, dans cet ordre, avant de proclamer l'accomplissement des temps qui implique de l'homme une double attitude liée à une même fonction du langage: la *simplicité*, qui est la disposition par laquelle toute parole s'accomplit, et l'*absence de critique* et de reproche à l'égard d'autrui, parce que ce sont des usages non créatifs de la parole. Le signe de l'accomplissement des temps est donné trois fois par une sorte de formule qui commande et articule les 8 parties:

- 1,1 Jésus (est) Dieu et Seigneur
- 2,1 Jésus (est) notre Seigneur de gloire
- 5,11 Jésus (est) allé jusqu'au τέλος qui signifie à la fois la fin, donc la mort, la perfection (τέλειος est formé sur τέλος) et le tribut (que l'on paie au τελωνής, mot dérivé également de τέλος).

Ce sont là quelques idées neuves sur l'épître de Jc: les développer serait le sujet d'un nouvel article. Nous les énonçons simplement en espérant inciter à la lecture du texte. Elles conviennent à un texte adoptant parfois la leçon «occidentale» et utilisant comme plan les divisions du type palestinien: il nous semble vraisemblable que ce soit le projet de l'œuvre initiale. Le témoignage des versions géorgiennes de Jc est au cœur de cette lecture théologique du texte.

Centre de documentation
sur les manuscrits de la Bible
(C.N.R.S.)
13, rue Louis Perrier
34000 MONTPELLIER, France

C. B. AMPHOUX-Dom B. OUTTIER

⁽¹⁸⁾ Notre enquête sur le sens théologique de Jc a progressé, notamment grâce à la très suggestive lecture du *Style Oral* de Marcel JOUSSE, rééd. Paris 1981. Nous nous éloignons donc des concl. provisoires de l'art. en référence n. 1 (p. 399).

חֶרֶט in the Manufacture of the Golden Calf

In two earlier issues of this periodical Samuel E. Loewenstamm clarified and largely resolved most of the literary problems attendant on Exod 32,4a.20.24, the biblical account of the manufacture and destruction of the Golden Calf⁽¹⁾. Yet, while one may endorse in its entirety Loewenstamm's analysis of the calf's annihilation, and, in nearly all its particulars, his summation of the process involved in the calf's production: "Aaron bound (צור) the gold in a חֶרֶט — a cloak or bag [—] and made the calf (v. 4) by casting the gold into the fire, whereupon the calf emerged of itself (v. 24)"⁽²⁾, two questions, nevertheless, remain to be addressed more specifically. These concern the noun, *heret*: its vocalization, and its definition⁽³⁾.

A noun, *heret*, appears otherwise in Biblical Hebrew only in Isa 8,1, where it bears the meaning "writing implement, stylus". Were this meaning, or its extension to "graving tool", to be applied to Exod 32,4a, *wayyāšar... baḥeret*, it would not only create an incongruity — a molten image is not produced with a stylus or graving tool — and a context irreconcilably at odds with Aaron's account of the idol's manufacture in Exod 32,24, but it would also belie its closely related and obviously parallel construction in 2 Kgs 5, 23. The latter reads: *wayyāšar... bišnē ḥarīṭīm* "And he (Naaman) bound (two talents of silver) in two *ḥarīṭīm*". The self-evident relationship between Exod 32,4a and 2 Kgs 5,23 — noted long before by the medieval commentator, Rashi, who proposed it as an alternative understanding — inspired Martin Noth to recommend emendation of *heret* in Exod 32,4a to **hārīṭ*, an unattested but presumed singular of *ḥarīṭīm*, and to render it "bag"⁽⁴⁾.

There is no need, I submit, for revocalization of *heret* to **hārīṭ* / **h(ā)ṛīṭ* in order to affirm the correlation of Exod 32,4a and 2 Kgs 5,23. Nor is there adequate warrant for the translation of *heret* / *ḥarīṭīm* by "bag(s)".

(1) *Bib* 48 (1967) 481-490; *Bib* 56 (1975) 330-343.

(2) *Bib* 48 (1967) 489.

(3) Initially, Loewenstamm rendered equivocally, "a cloak or bag" (*ibid.*, 487, 489), but later rejected "bag" (*Bib* 56 [1975] 337).

(4) M. NOTH, "Zur Anfertigung des 'goldenen Kalbes'", *VT* 9 (1959) 419-422. C. C. TORREY had also recommended emendation of *heret* to **hārīṭ*, but understood it to mean "mold" (*JBL* 55 [1936] 259 f., *JNES* 2 [1943] 301), and this has been followed, e.g., by P. HYATT, *Commentary on Exodus* (London 1971) 304; R. E. CLEMENTS, *Exodus* (Cambridge 1972), 201 (translation only; no comment is provided *ibid.*, 206); and R. A. COLE, *Exodus* (Downer's Grove, Ill. 1973) 213 f. For the background of this latter interpretation and objections to it, raised already by Bochartus, see LOEWENSTAMM, *Bib* 48 (1967) 486; *Bib* 56 (1975) 336.

The relationship between *heret* of Exod 32,4a, a segholate noun in singular number, and *ḥarīṭīm* of 2 Kgs 5,23, a noun in plural number fashioned on the base, q(a)ṭīl, parallels with precision the relationship that is generally acknowledged to exist between *pesel* "idol" and *p̄sīlīm*. Biblical Hebrew does not provide attestation for the expected plural of *pesel*, *p̄sālīm, nor for the expected singular of *p̄sīlīm*, *p(ā)sīl. Rather, *p̄sīlīm* serves as the plural of *pesel*, and *pesel* as the singular of *p̄sīlīm*. In like manner may one view the noun, *zimirā* "song", for which no plural, *zēmārôt, is in evidence, and *zēmīrôt* "songs", for which no common-noun in singular number, *zēmīrā, is in evidence⁽⁵⁾. That is to say, *zēmīrôt* functions as the plural of *zimirā*, and *zimirā* as the singular of *zēmīrôt*. Less certain because of the paucity of occurrences, but relevant nonetheless, is *neṭa', pausal form: *nāṭa'* "plant" (Job 14,9), for which no plural, *nṭā'īm, is attested, and the plural, *neṭī'īm* "plants" (Ps 144,12), for which no singular, *n(ā)ṭīa', is attested. In light of *pesel*, *zimirā*, and *nāṭa'*, and their functional plurals, *p̄sīlīm*, *zēmīrôt*, and *neṭī'īm*, one may reasonably and justifiably regard *heret* of Exod 32,4a as the functional singular of *ḥarīṭīm*, and *ḥarīṭīm* of 2 Kgs 5,23 as the functional plural of *heret*.

According to Exod 32,4a, then, Aaron bound (*wayyāšar* < *šūr*) the donated golden rings in a *heret*, just as Naaman, according to 2 Kgs 5,23, bound (*wayyāšar* < *šūr*) his gift of two silver talents in two *ḥarīṭīm*.

In modern commentaries *ḥarīṭīm* of 2 Kgs 5,23 has regularly been taken to mean "bags", with support for this definition sought in Arabic *ḥarīṭa*, a term for a bag or pouch made of leather, rag, or other material⁽⁶⁾. And this meaning has as regularly been applied to the word's one other occurrence in Isa 3,22, where, written fully, *ḥarīṭīm* appears in a list of women's finery. But in this latter passage, immediately following three terms for garments — *maḥlāšôt* "robes", *ma'atāpôt* "overtunics", *mitpāhôt* "cloaks" — and imme-

⁽⁵⁾ The personal name, *zēmīrā* (1 Chr 7,8) is hardly relevant. A masculine noun, *zāmīr, in construct state, *zēmīr*, assumed to mean "song", and considered to be the singular of *zēmīrôt* (BDB 274; KBL 259), occurs in Isa 25,5. The passage, however, is difficult, and the phrase in which it is found, *zēmīr 'arīšīm ya'neh*, is omitted in LXX. See G. B. GRAY, ZAW 31 (1911) 118-121; idem, *The Book of Isaiah I-XXXIX* (ICC; New York 1912) 428.

⁽⁶⁾ E.g., C. F. BURNEY, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings* (LBS; New York 1970 [Oxford, 1903]) 282; J. A. MONTGOMERY, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings* (ICC; Edinburgh 1950; ed. by H. S. GELMAN) 380; J. GRAY, *I + II Kings, A Commentary* (OTL; Philadelphia 1970) 509.

Arabic *ḥarīṭa* is understood to derive from the root, *ḤRT* "to strip (a tree of its bark or leaves)". Noth's reasoning, that *ḥarīṭa* must originally have denoted a bag of bark, and afterward came to mean a bag made of other material (VT 9 [1959] 420), is an exercise in fantasy. Similarly fantastic is his attempt to determine the motive behind, or the significance of, Aaron's act of binding the golden rings in a "bag". Observing that in 2 Kgs 5,23 the "bags" served as a means for transporting precious metal, Noth applied this purpose to Exod 32,4a, and suggested that the author wanted to imply that Aaron had the collected gold removed to a secret place where the manufacture of the sacred image could proceed without the Israelites looking on, thus to protect the treasure from those among them who might have coveted it (ibid., 422).

diately preceding (in v. 23) four other terms for articles of dress — *gilyônîm* “smocks”⁽⁷⁾, *s’dinîm* “mantles”⁽⁸⁾, *ṣenipôṭ* “turbans”, and *rdîdîm* “wraps”⁽⁹⁾ — it appears far more likely that *ḥarîṭîm* will have denoted items of clothing rather than bags or purses. Note, too, that while the Greek nouns in LXX’s rendering of this list may be difficult to correlate with their Hebrew counterparts, no word for bags or purses is present. If LXX translated Hebrew *ḥarîṭîm* here, it was by some expression for raiment. The prevailing modern view notwithstanding, in Isa 3,22 *ḥarîṭîm* seems to have designated clothing⁽¹⁰⁾.

The probability that *ḥeret* of Exod 32,4a and its functional plural, *ḥarîṭîm* of 2 Kgs 5,23, denoted items of apparel and not bag(s) or purse(s), may furthermore be inferred from the location that is common to the two passages, the phrases, *wayyāṣar ... baḥeret* and *wayyāṣar ... biṣnê ḥarîṭîm*. Observe that, whereas in Biblical Hebrew one “puts” (*šûm*, *ntn*) things in bags — Gen 43, 22.23; 44,1.2; cf. 1 Sam 17,40 — one “ties, binds” (*šrr*, *šûr*) things in garments. Cf. the following: “... Who has bound (*šārar*) the waters in a cloak (*šimlā*) ...?” (Prov. 30,4); “... their kneading bowls (were) bound up (*ṣrūrôt*) in their cloaks (*šimlôtām*) ...” (Exod 12,34); “... and you shall bind (*wṣartā*) them in your skirts / hems (*biknāpēkā*)” (Ezek 5,3)⁽¹¹⁾.

Idiom or procedure, too, confirms the general definition of *ḥeret* in Exod 32,4a, as of *ḥarîṭîm* in 2 Kgs 5,23, as wearing apparel⁽¹²⁾.

(7) A West Semitic loanword in Akkadian, it appears as *gulēnu* and *gulānu*, and has been defined as “(a coat)” in *CAD* G 127, and as “Obergewand” in *AHW* 296 f. The editors of these dictionaries, however, identify the word with Hebrew **g’lôm* and Aramaic *g’līmā*. The correct identification was first made by F. E. PEISER, *ZAW* 17 (1897) 348, who reasonably suggested a revocalization of *gilyônîm* to **g’lînîm*. (Note that this would restore a sequence of nouns of similar formation). See more recently, D. Winton THOMAS in *BHS*, 680, ad loc., n.

(8) Cf. Akkadian *s/šaddinu*. The determinative, TUG, identifies the word as a term for a garment. See *AHW* 1001 b.

(9) Probably a West Semitic loanword in Akkadian, *raddidu*, *raddadu* “ein Kleidungsstück”, occurs in plural. See *AHW* 941 a.

(10) Cf. Rashi on 2 Kgs 5,23. In modern times, cf. C. RABIN, *Tarbiz* 33 (1964) 112-114.

(11) Cf. Hos 4,19.

(12) Note that the same idiom or procedure occurs in Aramaic: e.g., *hww ṣyyryn bṣwṣyph tlt’ dynry* “three dinars were bound up in her cloak” (*Lev. Rab.* 6,150), and *hww gbr’ d’ škh’ rb’h* [var. + *m’h*] *zwy ṣyyry bsdyn’* “Someone once found four [var. + hundred] zûz which were bound up in a mantle” (*B. Meṣ* 24 b).

In Akkadian, the bag itself may be tied, as in *šumma kīsašu urakki[smā]* ... “If he has tied his bag ...” (*KAR* 423 r. i 62 [*CAD* K 431]), but items are “put” in bags, e.g., *inūme kīsam tušēbalanni šaptam šuknam* “when you send me the bag, put wool (in it) ...” (*BIN* 6 7:16; *BIN* 4 9:18 [*CAD* K 430]), and “tied” in garment hems, e.g., *kaspa ina qanni mārtiya artakas* “I tied ... silver in my daughter’s hem” (*RA* 23 152 No. 42:8), see the several references in *AHW* 946 sub *rakāsu*, and *CAD* Q 83-85 sub *qannu* B (usages b 3’, c and d).

Evidence for the determination of what specific item of clothing may have been denoted by *heret* and its functional plural, *ḥrītīm*, is indirect, but cumulative and suggestive. Loewenstamm noted, e.g., that Tg. Yer. I translates *heret* in Exod 32,4a by *šwšyp*, a term found elsewhere in the Targums to render Hebrew *simlā* "cloak" (13). In addition, he drew attention to Judg 8,25,27, a text in which a procedure, similar to that described in Exod 32,2-4a though more abbreviated, is recorded of Gideon. In preparation for the manufacture of the sacred ephod, a cloak (*simlā*) was spread, and each man "cast thither the ring(s) of his booty" (Judg 8,25). In Judg 8,24,26, just as in Exod 32,2,3, these rings are characterized more precisely as *nizmē* (*haz*) *zāhāb* "rings of gold". The two passages are comparable, then, in that in each of them a cultic object is produced from donated golden rings that have been assembled — in the one in a *heret*, and in the other in a *simlā* "cloak" (14). That is to say, just as in those passages which were used to illustrate the idiom or procedure discussed above, *šūr baḥeret* and *šrr bašsimlā*, so in these passages *heret* and *simlā* function similarly, i.e., they are utilized in similar ways.

Insofar as Tg. Yer. I, alone among the ancient versions, renders *heret* by *šwšyp* "cloak" (15), it stands as an isolated witness to the direct correspondence in meaning between *heret* and *simlā*, and cannot be considered determinative. It is therefore of interest to note that Tg. Jon., on 2 Kgs 5,23, renders *ḥrītīm* by *pild'sin* "cloaks", a term employed elsewhere to render Hebrew *s'dinīm* "mantles" (Judg 14,12) and *š'lāmôt* "cloaks" (2 Chr 9,24). The latter, plural of *šalmā*, is a metathetic variant of *š'mālôt*, plural of *šimlā* (16). And though somewhat ambiguous, LXX's translation of *ḥrītīm* here by (*en dusi*) *thulákois* may tend also to corroborate this understanding, for while the noun in singular number, *thulakos*, means "bag", in plural number it serves to designate an article of clothing said to have been worn by Persians and other Near Easterners (17). That the latter meaning was the one intended here may perhaps be inferred from the observation that, while the

(13) Loewenstamm cited Tg. Onq. on Deut 22,17 and Tg. Jon. on 1 Sam 21,10 (*Bib* 48 [1967] 487; *Bib* 56 [1975] 337, n. 1). Cf. also Tg. Yer. II and Tg. Neof. on Exod 12,34.

On *šwšyp* see S. A. KAUFMAN, *Akkadian Influences on Aramaic* (AS 19; Chicago and London 1974) 104.

(14) Though one may be tempted to follow Loewenstamm here, too much ought not to be made of the fact that the term for *nezem* in Jewish Aramaic (e.g., Tg. Onq. on Exod 32,2,3) and in Syriac is *qds'*, and to ascribe to *nezem*, thereby, an inherently sacred character (*Bib* 56 [1975] 337). Aramaic *qds'* is a loanword from Akkadian *qudašu* "ring" (*CAD* Q 293 f.; *AHW* 925 b). Cf. KAUFMAN, *Akkadian Influences on Aramaic*, 86.

(15) Tg. Onq.: *zyp* "mold", Tg. Neof.: *ṭwps* "mold". LXX render *en tē graphidi* "with a stylus", and Vulg.: *opere fusorio* "by a casting process".

(16) For other such metathetic variants in Biblical Hebrew, cf. *z'wā'ā* "a trembling" (Isa 28,19) with *za'wā* (Dt 28,25), *kebeš* "lamb" (Exod 29,39) with *kešeb* (Lv 14,10), *kibšā* "ewe-lamb" (2 Sam 12,3) with *kišbā* (Lv 5,6). *'awlā* "injustice" (2 Sam 3,34) with *'alwā* (Hos 10,9), etc.

(17) Cf. H. G. LIDDELL, R. SCOTT, and H. DRISLER, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (New York 1859) 647 a.

noun in singular number finds employment in the sense of "bag" once again in Aquila's translation of Gen 42,27, LXX make use of other terms to render Hebrew words for "bag": *marsippos* for Hebrew *'amtahat* (Gen 42-43, *passim*) and for Hebrew *šaq* (Gen 42,27), *sakkos* for Hebrew *šaq* (Gen 42,25.35; Jos 9,4), and *sullogé* for Hebrew *yalqût* (1 Sam 17,40). In view of the identification of *heret* as an article of dress, of the indirect evidence afforded by parallel functions and some earlier translations, which tend to correlate *heret* and *šimlâ*, and the fact that, among all the varied garments listed in Isa 3,22.23, the well-known term, *š'mālôt*, is conspicuous by its absence, one is led to hazard the opinion that *h'rîṭim* in this passage may have served as its substitute, and that *heret* and *šimlâ* were approximately synonymous.

The terms, *heret* "cloak" in Exod 32,4a, and *heret* "stylus" in Isa 8,1, would appear to be no more than homonyms. Whether either of these may trace its origin to the root, *ḤRT* — in Ugaritic "to pluck (a bird of its feathers)", in Arabic "to strip (a tree of its bark or leaves)" — is perhaps possible, but uncertain. With regard, however, to the possible derivation of *heret* "cloak" from this root, one may remark that, if Hebrew *maḥlāšôt* "robes" derives from the root, *Ḥ/HLS* "to draw off, strip", and Hebrew *gilyônîm* /*g'linîm "smocks" from the root, *GLY* "to uncover, remove", these would provide analogous semantic developments⁽¹⁸⁾.

Hebrew Union College –
Jewish Institute of Religion
3077 University Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90007
U.S.A.

Stanley GEVIRTZ

⁽¹⁸⁾ Cf. Akkadian *šubātu* "garment", which may derive from *šabātu* "to seize". See AHW 1107 a.

Two Stanzas of a Hymn in Deuteronomy 33*

In a recent article on "The Poetic Structure of the Framework of Deuteronomy 33", D. N. Freedman presented an intriguing scansion and translation of Deut 33,2-5 and 26-29 which he supported by statistical arguments⁽¹⁾. On the basis of a method of syllable-counting he demonstrated a degree of symmetry between the "Proem" (vv. 2-5) and the "Closing" (vv. 26-29) which is simply too elegant in its detail to be dismissed easily as mere reading of a theory into the evidence.

Though Freedman is often grouped with certain other scholars as representing a school of thought in regards Hebrew meter, it is important to see his work in historical perspective and to note a number of important distinctions. As early as 1960 Freedman discussed the possibility of counting syllables as a means of determining the prosodic structure of Hebrew poetry⁽²⁾; but the method itself was not applied in earnest until after 1968⁽³⁾. A spate of related articles soon followed on the part of D. N. Freedman, F. M. Cross, and some of their students, particularly from 1970-76⁽⁴⁾. But as early as 1972 Freedman had already begun to turn his attention to statistical approaches where emendation of the text was not necessary⁽⁵⁾.

Meanwhile, beginning in 1976, the study of Hebrew poetry seems to have taken a quantum leap of sorts. The time seemed right for a fundamental reassessment of the subject in a manner that called for more than isolated journal articles. In his *Studies in Early Hebrew Meter* (Scholars Press 1976), D. Stuart presented a systematic assessment of Cross's approach to archaic Hebrew poetry. At the same time, A. M. Cooper was completing his Ph. D. dissertation at Yale, "Biblical Poetics: A Linguistic Approach" (1976) which was based on a new approach to Hebrew meter formulated by the Polish

* This paper was written while in residence at the École Biblique in Jerusalem. I am particularly grateful to Profs. Marcel Sigrist, Raymond Tournay, Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, and Luke Dempsey for making this not only a most enjoyable time but also the most fruitful sabbatical break I have had — both academically and spiritually.

⁽¹⁾ *The Bible World: Essays in Honor of Cyrus H. Gordon* (New York 1980) 25-46.

⁽²⁾ "Archaic Forms in Early Hebrew Poetry", *ZAW* 72 (1960) 167.

⁽³⁾ Beginning with an article by D. N. FREEDMAN, "The Structure of Job 3", *Bib* 49 (1968) 503-510.

⁽⁴⁾ See T. LONGMAN, "A Critique of Two Recent Metrical Systems", *Bib* 63 (1982) 232-233 for a brief discussion of these articles which are listed in notes 11 and 12.

⁽⁵⁾ "Acrostics and Metrics in Hebrew Poetry", *HTR* 65 (1972) 367-392.

linguist J. Kurylowicz, a method which will be discussed in greater detail later in this article. Two years later T. Collins published his dissertation, *Line-Forms in Hebrew Poetry: A Grammatical Approach to the Stylistic Study of the Hebrew Prophets* (Rome 1978), which was based in large measure on the modern linguistic theory of Generative Grammar. Working independently, S. Geller applied principles from modern linguistic theory to a perennial problem in his Harvard dissertation, *Parallelism in Early Biblical Poetry* (Scholars Press 1979). In a lengthy dissertation, P. van der Lugt reviewed the study of Hebrew poetry from the time of J. L. Saalschütz (1825, 1853) to the present and attempted a rather ambitious synthesis which he applied to a selection of 57 psalms in his *Strofische Structuren in de Bijbels-Hebreeuwse Poësie* (Kampen 1980). The year 1980 also saw the publication of M. O'Connor's monumental study, *Hebrew Verse Structure* (Eisenbrauns 1980), which grew out of a dissertation under D. N. Freedman. O'Connor's work is also a synthesis of modern linguistic theory and traditional classic description of Hebrew poetry. And most recently, a major study by J. Kugel, *The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and its History* (Yale 1981) created no small stir in the section on Hebrew Poetry at the 1982 meetings of the Society of Biblical Literature in New York⁽⁶⁾. Kugel's most important contribution is probably that of raising the fundamental question of our use of the terms "poetry" and "prose" in the Hebrew Bible. There is no clear distinction between the two categories since we are apparently dealing with some sort of continuum⁽⁷⁾.

The time is ripe for a new round of debate and for continued reassessment of our various systems of metrical analysis in light of specific texts. An important step in this direction was taken recently by T. Longman in his critique of "Syllable-Count Meter" as described by D. Stuart and the "Syntactic-Accentual Meter" of A. M. Cooper in terms of specific texts which included Deut 33,7-29⁽⁸⁾. This particular article is an attempt to build on the work of both Freedman and Longman, and hopefully to move a step beyond them both, at least in terms of the formulation of a comprehensive system of prosodic analysis which combines the two complementary approaches which have emerged in recent discussion.

As Longman has noted, there are three important distinctions that set Freedman's work off from that of Stuart (and his mentor Cross). First, Freedman and Stuart disagree in regard to the oral origin of Hebrew poetry. As Longman put it, "one of the motivating factors in Cross and Stuart's metrical analysis, as opposed to Freedman, is the assumption that the poems were originally composed orally" (p. 235). A second point of disagreement

⁽⁶⁾ Kugel's book was the focus of attention for a series of seven papers which were presented on Dec. 21, 1982 to an audience of well over 100 persons.

⁽⁷⁾ P. D. MILLER stressed this point in his paper, "Meter, Parallelism, and Tropes: The Search for Poetic Style", at the 1982 SBL meetings. I have explored the lack of a clear boundary between "poetry" and "prose" at some length in "Prose and Poetry in the Bible: The Narrative Poetics of Deuteronomy 1:9-18", *ZAW* (forthcoming).

⁽⁸⁾ *Ibid.*, 243-247.

involves their basic approach to the Masoretic text. Freedman is more conservative than Stuart. As Freedman has put it, "it would be methodologically untenable to emend the text in the interests of a certain metrical or strophic structure or to base such a structure on an emended text" (cited by Longman, p. 235). For Stuart a poem must be restored to its original state before it can be analyzed prosodically. To that end he lists a series of rules in order to reconstruct the text (p. 235). And third, there is a fundamental difference in how the two scholars conceive the very nature of the analytic task as such. "While Stuart holds that a syllable count yields the meter of a poem, Freedman emphasizes that syllable counting is . . . simply a convenient way to describe the structure of a poem" (p. 236). In short, there is some confusion in precisely what is meant by the term "meter".

For most scholars in the field the traditional approach to Hebrew meter remains that of the Ley-Sievers method which focuses on patterns of word-stress within given poetic lines. Recently J. Kurylowicz has criticized this approach suggesting an important modification which will be used in this study⁽⁹⁾. As Kurylowicz has noted, Sievers was quite right in his monumental study *Metrische Studien* (Leipzig 1901-07) when he excluded such factors as "parallelism of members" and other stylistic factors from the domain of Hebrew metrics. As he put it, "Parallelism of members etc. are adornments proper to poetic style, but must be left out of consideration in the analysis of the metre⁽¹⁰⁾". This statement deserves some qualification as it is only with meter in terms of rhythm or accentual "beats" within a given line that "parallelism of members" as such is not significant. Some aspects of parallelism can be described quantitatively through a system of prosodic analysis to be described below. Here it is important simply to describe how Kurylowicz' approach differs from that of Sievers. By paying careful attention to the diacritical marks of the Masoretic accentual system, Kurylowicz has devised a system of "Syntactic-Accentual Meter"⁽¹¹⁾. In short, he counts syntactic units rather than individual words. Thus some independent nouns and verbs lose their accent altogether when considered from a metrical point of view.

Those who count syllables are not primarily concerned with "meter" in the sense of rhythmic beats or stresses within a given line. Counting syllables is essentially a means of assessing the length of poetic lines rather than the rhythmical manner in which those same lines were spoken (or sung). In short, the phenomenon of "parallelism of members", taken in the broadest sense, does produce quantitative parallelism which can often be shown by counting syllables, regardless of how the rhythmic stresses of that particular line were read. But since the Hebrew language makes a distinction between long and short vowels, there is a need to modify such an approach if one hopes to assign a meaningful number to the relative length of poetic lines, if such numbers are to reflect the amount of time required to speak or sing those lines.

⁽⁹⁾ *Studies in Semitic Grammar and Metrics* (London 1973); and *Metrik und Sprachgeschichte* (Wrocław 1975).

⁽¹⁰⁾ *Ibid.* (1973), 176.

⁽¹¹⁾ The term is that of T. LONGMAN, *ibid.*, 238.

A useful approach to measuring the length of lines in poetry is that of counting morae, i.e. the length of time required to say the simplest syllable from a phonetic point of view. Though this approach to scanning Hebrew poetry has been around a long time, it has not been the subject of serious discussion in recent years. Counting morae was a dominant feature in the study of Hebrew prosody from the middle of the 17th to the early 19th centuries⁽¹²⁾. In that earlier era the method was known as the "Alting-Danzian System" which survived into the 19th century, particularly in the work of J. Bellermann (1813), J. L. Saalschütz (1825, 1853), and the "rhythmisches Morengesetz" of H. Grimme (1896-97, 1903)⁽¹³⁾. The major problem with these earlier versions of counting morae is that the system itself was overly refined and shaped by comparative study of more familiar patterns in classical Greek and Latin poetry. Individual syllables were divided into four categories which were assigned from one to four morae. Modern poetic scansion in languages where there is a significant difference in vowel length takes a much simpler approach⁽¹⁴⁾. The consonants as such are ignored and the vowels are assigned to one of two categories — phonetically short or long, the former being considered one mora and the latter two morae.

By means of counting both morae and syntactic-accentual stresses I have already attempted to show that the "Song of Jonah" (Jonah 2,1-11) includes two virtually identical stanzas from a prosodic point of view, which scan on the basis of mora-count $/127+85=212//124+87=211/$ and in terms of rhythmic stresses or "beats" $/4:4:4/3:3:3:3:3//4:4:4/3:3:3:3:4/$ ⁽¹⁵⁾. Such symmetry in detail must reflect musical constraint of some sort, and thus I have argued that the "Song of Jonah" includes two stanzas as that term is commonly used in the field of hymnology. Curiously, however, the two stanzas in the "Song of Jonah" include the so-called "prose framework" of the familiar psalm of Jonah (2,3-10).

I have been anxious to test the method of analysis in other contexts where there is reason to suspect the existence of a similar phenomenon, and the hymnic framework to the Blessing of Moses in Deut 33 thus caught my

⁽¹²⁾ For a brief summary of this early period see B. PICK, "The Study of Hebrew Among Jews and Christians", *Bibliotheca Sacra* 42 (1885) 490-493. I am grateful to Walter Bodine for this reference.

⁽¹³⁾ J. ALTING, *Fundamenta punctuationis linguae sanctae* (1654), was apparently the first to propose the *systema morarum*. J. DANZ, *Compendium gramm. ebr. chaldaic.* (1699), developed Alting's theory into the *systema trium morarum*. Among those who accepted the Alting-Danzian System were B. SPINOZA (1677), H. B. STARKE (1707), J. W. MEINER (1748, 1757) and J. HIRT (1771). For a detailed listing of 19th century publications see W. H. COBB, *A Criticism of Systems of Hebrew Metre* (Oxford 1905) 191-202.

⁽¹⁴⁾ The use of mora-count in scanning Japanese poetry was described by James Hoad, of the University of Oregon (private communication). For a similar counting system based on *mātrās* ("instants") with the long vs. short vowel distinction, see V. P. VATUK, "Poetics and Genre-typology in Indian Folklore", in *Studies in Indian Folk Tradition* (New Delhi 1979). I am grateful to Sue Clark, one of my students, for this citation.

⁽¹⁵⁾ See my article, "The Song of Jonah: A Metrical Analysis", *JBL* (forthcoming).

attention. It would appear that, though Freedman has taken us a long way in the right direction, the actual poetic symmetry of the two passages in question is even more elegant than he has shown.

The method of scansion presented here does not in any way negate the work of those many scholars who have done so much to elucidate the host of problems inherent in this ancient poem. There is a long history behind the present text of Deut 33 and much has been accomplished by way of explaining its origin and meaning. But whatever its original significance, this archaic poem was utilized within the canonical text of what Freedman has called the "Primary History" (i.e. Genesis through 2 Kings in the Hebrew Canon)⁽¹⁶⁾. In that setting the text of Deut 33,2-5 and 26-29 also had meaning. It is that latter meaning that is the focus of attention here. This particular analysis focuses primarily on the present shape of the canonical text with minimal "correction". It also takes seriously the Masoretic accentual system as its point of departure. The following is a transliteration and translation of the text with a summary of the metrical analysis.

Deut 33,2-5 & 26-29a⁽¹⁷⁾

9	YHWH / miššīnay bā' /	(2)	YHWH / from Sinai He came. /	2
13	w'zārah miššē'ir / lāmō /		He shone forth from Seir / for	
			them; /	2
12	hōpīa' / mēhar pā'rān /		He burst forth / from Mount Pa-	
			ran. /	2
14	w'ātāh / mērib'bōt qōdeš		He marched / from Ribebboth-kod-	
	//		esh, //	2
{	6 mīmīnō /		From His Southland /	{
	9 'āšēdōt ⁽¹⁸⁾ lāmō //		to the mountain slopes for	
			them. //	1

⁽¹⁶⁾ "Canon of the OT", in *IDB Sup. Vol.* (Nashville 1976) 131-132.

⁽¹⁷⁾ As FREEDMAN has noted, "The final couplet (v. 29b) is substantially longer than any other bicolon in the framework of the poem, and stands somewhat apart from the rest of the material" ("The Poetic Structure of Deuteronomy 33", 36). I have accepted Freedman's re-pointing of the term 'ēšdāt in v. 2 but have chosen to retain the term wa'āšer which is re-pointed as a verbal form in v. 29. The Masoretes apparently normalized the longer -ka for a dialectal variant as suggested by the final kaph in the orthography. I am essentially following STEVENS who rejected the longer form and read instead *-ak after singular nouns and *-ēk after plural nouns (*Metrische Studien*, I, 316-17). P. KAHLE amassed considerable evidence to support a similar conclusion in *The Cairo Geniza* (London 1947) 95-102. F. M. CROSS and D. N. FREEDMAN presented still further arguments for the same conclusions in *Early Hebrew Orthography* (New Haven 1952) 55, 65-66.

⁽¹⁸⁾ The MT may be reading 'ēšdāt as a place name. It seems best to re-point the term with Freedman to read 'āšēdōt, "mountain slopes" (cf. Deut 3,17; 4,49). Behind the present text there may be an archaic expression which was no longer understood by those who used this hymn in its present context. For a similar situation involving confusion of the same archaic verbal roots 'th, 'šr and 'sd see Num 21,14 and my discussion in *CBQ* 36 (1974) 360 together

8 'ap ḥōbēb 'ammîm /	(3) Indeed, the protector of peoples;	
10 kol-q ^c dōšāw / b ^c yādek(a) //	/	1
	All His holy ones / are at your	2
	hand. //	
9 w ^c hēm / tukkû l ^c raglek(a) /	Yea, they / bow themselves at	2
	your feet. /	
10 yiśšā' middab ^c rōtêk(a) //	He upholds the pronouncements	1
	entrusted to you. //	
14 tōrāh šiwwāh-lānû / mōšeh	(4) Moses / charged instruction	
//	to us //	2
13 mōrāšāh / q ^c hillat ya'āqōb	His heritage, / the assembly of Ja-	
//	cob. //	2
11 wayhî bišūrûn / melek //	(5) And in Jeshurun He became /	
	king — //	2
11 b ^c hit'assēp / rā'sē 'ām /	When the chiefs of the people /	
	gathered /	2
10 yaḥad / šibṭē yiśrā'ēl //	In conclave / the tribes of	
	Israel. //	2

* * *

11 'ēn kā'ēl / y ^c šūrûn //	(26) There is none like God, / O Je-	
	shurun! //	2
11 rōkēb šamayim / b ^c 'ezrek(a)	Who rides the skies / for your	
/	help, /	2
14 ūb ^c ga'āwātō / š ^c ḥāqîm //	And in His splendor / the	
	clouds. //	2
12 m ^c 'ōnāh / 'ēlōhē qedem /	(27) A refuge / is the ancient God; /	2
5 ūmittaḥat /	And an undergirding /	1
9 z ^c rō'ōt 'ōlām //	are the arms of the Eternal. //	1
10 way ^c gāreš mippānêk(a) /	He drove out from before you /	1
4 'ōyēb /	the enemy; /	1
7 wayyō'mer hašmēd //	And He said, "Destroy!" //	1
9 wayyiškōn yiśrā'ēl /	(28) So Israel settled /	1
6 betaḥ bādād /	in untroubled safety — /	1
6 'ēn ya'āqōb /	Jacob's descendants. /	1
12 'el-'ereš / dāgān wtīrōš //	To the land / belong grain and	
	wine; //	2
11 'ap-šāmāw / ya'arpû-tāl //	Indeed, his skies / drip dew. //	2

with that of M. DAHOOD, *Ugaritic-Hebrew Philology* (Rome 1965) 52-53. The lines may originally have read *w^c'ittō-m rib^cbōt qōdeš / miminō 'ōš^cdōt* (or *'ōš^crōt*) *lāmō*, "And with him myriads of holy ones, / Marching apace at His right side".

{ 8 'ašrêk(a) 'yisrā 'êl /	(29) Happy are you, Israel! /	1 }
{ 6 mî kāmôk(a) /	Who is like you? /	1 }
{ 8 'am nôša ba-YHWH /	A people delivered by YHWH, /	1 }
{ 6 mägên 'ezrek(a) /	Shield of your help. /	1 }
4 wă 'āšar ⁽¹⁹⁾ /	And He marched on — /	1 }
7 ħereb ga 'āwātek(a) //	Sword of your splendor! //	1 }

The column to the left of the transliteration lists the mora-count of that line, which is simply the syllable-count plus one additional unit for each long vowel. The column to the right of the translation lists the number of syntactic-accentual units which, for the most part, coincides with the disjunctive marks in the Masoretic accentual system which are marked by a vertical slash with the 'atnaḥ and sillûq having a double slash. The horizontal lines within the two columns of figures indicate the boundaries of larger groupings of parallel metrical units.

The resulting structure is indeed symmetrical. On the basis of mora-count the stanzas are respectively /63+64+32=159/ and /62+65+39=166/. And if the final phrase *ħereb ga 'āwātek(a)* is taken as a coda, or extra-metrical element tacked onto the conclusion of the hymn, as suggested by the distribution of morae⁽²⁰⁾, the symmetry is nearly perfect, /63+64+32=159//62+65+32=159/. In terms of syntactic-accentual stresses both stanzas scan /2:2:2:2:2/3:3/2:2/2:2:2/. Moreover, these syntactic-accentual units group into identical patterns in terms of their content, namely /(2:2:2):(2:2)/3:3/2:2/2:2:2/ which suggests that the two could easily be sung to the same melody.

When analyzed in terms of content the prosodic units reveal a chiasmic or concentric arrangement on different levels, though the individual elements of such chiasmic structures do not necessarily coincide with metrical boundaries. The "Proem" (vv. 2-5) may be outlined as follows:

2-3c A - YHWH's March of Conquest from the Southland.

3d B - He upholds the pronouncements entrusted to you.

4 B' - His Torah is your heritage.

5 A' - YHWH's Reign in Jeshurun.

Here the outside elements focus on YHWH's traditional march of conquest which is related to YHWH's kingship in Jeshurun (Israel). The center focuses on the Torah, the teachings of Moses, as the heritage of Jacob/Israel.

The "Closing" (vv. 26-29a) may be outlined similarly:

26 A - There is no god like God ("El").

27a B - He is a refuge.

27b-28 B' - He is a warrior/deliverer.

29a A' - There is no people like Israel, a people delivered by YHWH.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Taking the *wa'āšer* of MT as the verbal root 'šr, "to walk, tread". Cf. Num 21,15 where the same confusion appears (see note 18 above).

⁽²⁰⁾ The closing extra-metrical unit in terms of mora-count consists of two syntactic-accentual units which, though paralleled elsewhere, is less common than a single unit.

Here the outside elements focus on the uniqueness of both God and Israel, as a people delivered by YHWH. The center focuses on God as refuge and source of security in the land.

When seen as a whole, the two halves of this poem take on a different focus as suggested in the following outline:

- 2 A – YHWH's March of Conquest from the Southland.
- 3-4 B – YHWH's Protection and Provision for His People.
- 5 C – YHWH is king in Jeshurun!
- 26 C' – There is none like God, O Jeshurun!
- 27-28 B' – Israel's Security and Blessing.
- 29 A' – Israel, a people Delivered by YHWH.

Here YHWH's march of conquest is an act of salvation for Israel (vv. 2 & 29a). YHWH's protection and provision (vv. 3-4) are the source of Israel's security and blessing (vv. 27-28). And at the center of the structure stands YHWH Himself who is Israel's king and beyond comparison (vv. 5 & 26).

As Freedman has noted, there are a number of rhetorical features which support the case for structural chiasm and symmetry⁽²¹⁾. The key word YHWH, set out at the very beginning of the poem (v. 2), appears only once again, at the end (v. 29), forming an inclusion. The unusual term for Israel, Jeshurun, occurs at the end of the "Proem" (v. 5) and in the beginning of the "Conclusion" (v. 26), and only two other times in the Hebrew Bible (Deut 32,15 and Isa 44,2). The end of each major division is marked by the repetition of the terms *'ām* and *yisrā'ēl* in reverse order (vv. 5 & 26). Moreover, the beginning and end of the "Conclusion" are marked by the repetition of *b'e'ezreka ūb'ga'āwātō* (v. 26) in *'ezreka . . . ga'āwāteka* (v. 29). Similar rhetorical markers are used to indicate boundaries of poetic units in the "Song of Jonah" (Jonah 2,1-11)⁽²²⁾.

I do not see any way to explain the symmetry observed in both instances apart from the constraints of a musical tune to which these words were set. It would appear that the arranger of the text in Deut 33 as it now stands took an existing hymn and used it to frame the presentation of the tribal blessings. At the conclusion of the first stanza of this hymn, and following the phrase *yahad šibtē yisrā'ēl*, "in conclave the tribes of Israel", the poet inserted a list of traditional blessings assigned to the individual tribes. Upon the completion of the list he took up the second stanza of the opening hymn as a fitting inclusion.

American Baptist Seminary
of the West and Graduate
Theological Union
2515 Hillegass Ave.
Berkeley CA 94704 U.S.A.

Duane L. CHRISTENSEN

⁽²¹⁾ "The Poetic Structure of Deuteronomy 33", 37.

⁽²²⁾ See J. WALSH, "Jonah 2,3-10: A Rhetorical Critical Study", *Bib* 63 (1982) 220 and my discussion in "The Song of Jonah: A Metrical Analysis", *JBL* (forthcoming).

Giud 2,3: *lšdym*

Giud 2,3 presenta una certa difficoltà di traduzione, dovuta soprattutto alla vocalizzazione e al valore sintattico di *lšdym*. Neppure Barthélemy giunge a una soluzione definitiva⁽¹⁾.

Si possono ricondurre i diversi tentativi di lettura di *lšdym* a due:

1. Si accetta la lettura consonantica masoretica, avanzando diverse proposte:

a) Si legge *lšiddīm* come se fosse il plurale di *šad*, traducendo «fianchi, lati»: «Vi staranno ai fianchi»⁽²⁾. In questa interpretazione si elimina però il troppo chiaro parallelismo tra le due parti dello stico, dove in *lšiddīm* e *l'môqēš* la preposizione *l* dovrebbe avere lo stesso valore, in quanto dipendente dal verbo *hyh*. Su 211 casi da me visti in cui *hyh* è costruito con doppio *l*, non ne esiste uno dove *l* abbia valore di *b*, come indicatore di uno stato in luogo. Perciò si dovrebbe tradurre per coerenza «vi saranno fianchi» e non «vi saranno ai fianchi»⁽³⁾.

La difficoltà di questa proposta è colta dai traduttori che, per mantenere il parallelo tra le due parti dello stico, inseriscono, seguendo Num 33,55 e Gios 23,13, *lišninīm*⁽⁴⁾. In realtà l'inserimento di *lišninīm* ancora una volta elimina il parallelo scandito da *lākem lšiddīm* e *lākem l'môqēš*, introducendo un elemento del tutto estraneo e superfluo alla costruzione dello stico. Inoltre il risultato di questo inserimento, che darebbe in Giud 2,3 b *lākem lišninīm*

⁽¹⁾ D. BARTHÉLEMY, *Critique Textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*. 1. Josué, Juges, Ruth, Samuel, Rois, Chroniques, Esdras, Néhémie, Esther (OBO 50/1; Fribourg/Göttingen 1982) 76: «Sans vouloir trancher cette question, concluons qu'il est prudent de ne pas quitter la lectio difficilior du M».

⁽²⁾ Cf. A. VACCARI, *La Sacra Bibbia*. I libri storici I (Firenze 1957); H. W. HERTZBERG, *Die Bücher Josua, Richter, Ruth* (ATD 9; Göttingen 1973): «Und sie sollen euch zu (Geisseln für eure) 'Seiten'» (147).

⁽³⁾ Il valore del sintagma *hāyāh l l* è uniforme e simile a quello di Giud 2,3: *l* + pronome suffisso (o nome personale o di popolo), *l* + x (altro elemento variabile). Il primo *l* ha valore dativale, il secondo introduce il predicato di *hāyāh*. Parliamo di primo e secondo solo per facilitare l'esposizione, anche se l'ordine può essere diverso. Solo in Lev 24,7 il primo *l* non è seguito da un nome personale (*lallehem*; cf. anche Deut 28,25 e 1 Cron 23,11). Abbiamo alcuni sintagmi in cui la funzione di uno dei due *l* si scosta dallo schema comune in Lev 7,8.14; 22,20; Num 5,9.10; 35,2; 2 Cron 16,8. Tuttavia in nessuno di questi casi *l* ha valore di *b* stato in luogo.

⁽⁴⁾ G. F. MOORE, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges* (ICC; Edinburgh 1908) 59; C. F. KEIL-F. DELITZSCH, *Josua, Richter und Ruth* (Biblischer Kommentar über das Alte Testament II/1; Leipzig 1874) 212; M.-J. LAGRANGE, *Le livre des Juges* (EB; Paris 1903) 23-24; IB II, 699; HERTZBERG, *Richter*, 147 (Integra, ma in parentesi; cf. n. 2).

lšiddīm, è una sequenza di preposizioni diversa sia da Num 33,55 (*wḥāyāh 'āšer tōtīrū mēhem lšikkīm b'ēnēkem wlišninīm bšiddēkem*) che da Gios 23,13 (*wḥāyū lākem lpaḥ ūlēmōqēš ūlēsōtēt bšiddēkem wlišninīm b'ēnēkem*), dove infatti abbiamo rispettivamente *l-b'* (oltretutto senza *hāyāh*) e *l-l-b'*, contro Giudici che ha solo *l-l'*. Se Giud 2,3 dipendesse da questi due testi, avrebbe semplicemente usato *b'* come preposizione di *šid-dīm*, e non *l'*, in chiaro parallelo con 3 bβ.

b) Schultens⁽⁵⁾ avvicinava a *šdym* l'aramaico *šad* di Dan 7,25, che interpretava con l'arabo *ḏidd* (= «contrario, nemico»). Cf. tuttavia E. Vogt, che traduce «lato»⁽⁶⁾.

Altri preferiscono proporre la derivazione dall'accadico *šaddu*, che traduce con «rete, laccio»⁽⁷⁾. Ma sia Gelb, Landsberger, Oppenheim⁽⁸⁾ che von Soden⁽⁹⁾ non riconoscono mai questo significato a *šaddu*. Anzi ambedue i dizionari traducono lo stesso testo citato da Delitzsch (4 R 26 no. 2: 20 f) dando a *šaddu* il significato abituale di «segno, segnale».

2. Si cambia il TM *lšdym* in *lšrym*. La proposta ha appigli molto antichi in quanto lettura supposta da T, LXX, V, e viene accettata dalla BHS e da molti autori⁽¹⁰⁾. Di per sé il cambio *rēš-dālet* è altrove attestato⁽¹¹⁾, ma la proposta delle versioni sembra un tentativo di *lectio facilior*⁽¹²⁾.

*
* * *

Rispettando la proposta consonantica del testo *lšdym*, esiste un'altra possibilità di lettura. L'immagine del v. 3 bβ è un'immagine di caccia. *Mōqēš* e il verbo *yqš* sono originariamente in rapporto con la cattura di una preda.

In senso reale, riferito cioè ad animale, cf. Am 3,5; Giob 40,24 e Sal 124,7. In senso metaforico Ger 50,24; Sal 69,23; 140,16; 141,9, etc. È particolarmente evidente questo significato quando *yqš* si usa insieme o in parallelo con *paḥ* (Gios 23,13; Sal 69,27; 124,7; 140,6; 141,9; Am 3,5; Os 9,8) e con *lkd* (Is 8,15; Ger 50,24; Am 3,5; Prov 6,3).

⁽⁵⁾ A. SCHULTENS, *Animadversiones philologicae et criticae ad varia loca Veteris Testamenti* (Leiden 1769) 160.

⁽⁶⁾ E. VOGT, *Lexicon Linguae Aramaicae Veteris Testamenti Documentis Antiquis Illustratum* (Roma 1971) 142.

⁽⁷⁾ Questo è il significato che F. DELITZSCH, *Prolegomena eines neuen hebräisch-aramäischen Wörterbuches zum Alten Testament*, (Leipzig 1866) 75, n. 4, dà a *šaddu*. È seguito da KBL, 793, e recentemente dalla TOB, 460.

⁽⁸⁾ I. J. GELB-B. LANDSBERGER-A. L. OPPENHEIM, *The Assyrian Dictionary*, 16 (Glückstadt 1962) 56.

⁽⁹⁾ W. von SODEN, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*, III (Wiesbaden 1981) 1073.

⁽¹⁰⁾ A. SCHULTZ, *Das Buch der Richter und das Buch Ruth* (Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments, II/4.5; Bonn 1926) 23; A. PENNA, *Giudici e Rut* (La Sacra Bibbia; Torino 1963) 53; C. F. BURNEY, *The Book of Judges* (The Library of Biblical Studies; New York 1970) 39; L. ALONSO SCHÖKEL-J. MATEOS, *Nueva Biblia Española* (Madrid 1975) 342; *Bible de Jérusalem; Einheitsübersetzung*.

⁽¹¹⁾ Cf. E. WÜRTHWEIN, *Der Text des Alten Testaments. Eine Einführung in die Biblia Hebraica* (Stuttgart 1973) 104.

⁽¹²⁾ Cf. BARTHÉLEMY, *Critique Textuelle*, 76.

Lo stretto parallelo formale tra le due parti dello stico ci lascia supporre che anche il v. 3 *bā* contenga un'immagine di caccia. È quanto si avrebbe leggendo *l'šādīm* invece di *l'šiddīm*. *Šādīm* sarebbe un participio attivo *qal* maschile plurale dalla radice *šwd*, attestata sia in ebraico che in accadico e ugaritico⁽¹³⁾. È vero che esiste anche il sostantivo *šayyād* (Ger 16,16), che è una forma *qātāl*. Tuttavia il participio *šād* è attestato in Gen 27,33 (*haššād šayid*). Ciò avvalorava la possibilità di impiego della forma participiale in Giud 2,3 anziché di quella nominale.

Riguardo al parallelo *šwd-yqš* non abbiamo altre attestazioni nel testo biblico. Tuttavia nel Sal 140 troviamo al v. 6 *paḥ-rešet-môqēš* e al v. 12 *šwd*. Il v. 12 è come la risposta al v. 6, messa in atto dall'intervento di Jahvé. Mentre al v. 6 i *gē'im* tendono laccio, rete, trappola (*tām'nū gē'im paḥ lī waḥābālīm pāršū rešet l'yad ma'gāl mōqēšīm šātū lī*) al v. 12 un male dà loro la caccia (*'iš lāšōn bal yikkōn bā'areš 'iš ḥāmās rā' yēšūdenū l'madḥēpōt*).

La lettura proposta si mostra coerente sia con il parallelo sintattico delle due parti dello stico sia con lo sviluppo delle immagini di 3b:

wehāyū lākem l'šādīm — e saranno per voi cacciatori, *wē'lōhēhem yihyū lākem l'môqēš* — e i loro dei saranno per voi trappola.

Pontificio Istituto Biblico
Via della Pilotta 25
00187 Roma

Ambrogio SPREAFICO

⁽¹³⁾ Cf. Gen 27,3.5.33; Lev 17,13; Ger 16,16; Ez 13,18.20; Mic 7,2; Sal 140,12; Giob 10,16; 38,39; Prov 6,26; Lam 3,25; 4,18; GELB-LANDSBERGER-OPPENHEIM, *Assyrian Dictionary*, 57; VON SODEN, *Handwörterbuch*, 1073; UT, *Glossary* 473; R. S. TOMBACK, *A Comparative Semitic Lexicon of Phoenician and Punic Languages* (SBL Dissertation Series 32; New York 1978) 276.

RES BIBLIOGRAPHICAE

Divergent Views on the Nature of the Greek of the Bible

“...at many points philology and social history overlap.”

G. A. DEISSMANN, *Light from the Ancient East*, 301.

I

Serious study of the LXX has normally been counted among the driest of the bones in the Valley of Academe. Hebraists have generally not seen much need to give attention to a translation of their primary source, unless the Hebrew passage is obscure; while Classicists who devote themselves to Greek literature and philology all too frequently think there is little worth reading beyond IV B.C. Further, because of the philosophical chasm established a couple of centuries ago between Biblical Studies and Classics, very few Classicists today ever venture out their trenches and make a foray into the other camp. One reason for this reluctance among Classicists is their lack of confidence that students of theology are taught their Greek well: and certainly one common indicator that all is not well is the belief, apparently widespread among such students, that ‘Biblical’ Greek is somehow ‘special’.

It was to this question that G. A. Deissmann addressed himself, and in his *Bible Studies* and *Light from the Ancient East*⁽¹⁾ he achieved two goals of permanent importance. First, he showed that the language of the Greek Bible (LXX and NT) was not a discrete corpus of sacred vocabulary and syntax. That it reflected quite naturally contemporary *koine* he demonstrated most effectively by recourse to the philological evidence of inscriptions and papyri. The former had been known aplenty beforehand, but with the sudden flood of papyrus discovery and publication from the end of last century their particular value in illuminating the language of the NT was emphasized by him. Deissmann was not the first to make this connection⁽²⁾, but his second particular contribution was to argue the case in no piecemeal fashion, and to popularize it.

⁽¹⁾ *Bible Studies* (ET: Edinburgh 1901; repr. Winona Lake, 1978); *Light from the Ancient East* (ET: London 1927; repr. Grand Rapids 1980) — henceforth *LAE*.

⁽²⁾ *LAE*, 68 n. 3.

By the time of the second English edition of *LAE* (1927), Deissmann was able to refer to complementary studies elsewhere which were providing further illustration of his thesis. The most systematic such attempt came to fruition in J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament, Illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-Literary Sources*⁽³⁾. How heavily the newer papyrological evidence predominated over epigraphical texts in MM can readily be ascertained from five minutes' browsing through that work. To that extent Deissmann's contribution was more balanced; but this is not to diminish the importance of MM's attempt to cover comprehensively the range of NT vocabulary. In some instances their lack of entry for a NT word betokens lack of non-literary attestation⁽⁴⁾; in other cases, mere inadvertence⁽⁵⁾. Some of their entries provide no documentary attestations⁽⁶⁾.

Deissmann appears to have written particularly with Lutheran (or, more generally, Protestant) pastors in mind, MM for Anglican clergy. Both readerships early this century could be assumed to be at home with Greek. The situation today is very different, of course, and many who learn Greek read only the NT. The lack of wider perspective provides little confidence that such a tool as MM will always be used critically and effectively. In the case of NT scholarship MM is still quoted as if it is the final and most complete statement on the subject of non-literary evidence for 'NT Greek'. Yet neither Deissmann nor MM saw their work as definitive in that way at all; even had their expectations been different we ought not to ignore the more than half-century of publications since their time⁽⁷⁾. Beyond question, Deissmann demonstrated the importance of such study and MM's attempt at comprehensive illustration was a magnificent achievement. Perhaps this is what has encouraged NT studies to assume that all had been gleaned which might reasonably be expected from such sources; hence the neglect, in such large measure, to build upon their foundation. To the extent that MM continues to be viewed as the 'final authority' for documentary evidence for vocabula-

⁽³⁾ Henceforth: MM. The first fascicle was published in 1914, the complete one-volume edition in 1930. MOULTON died before the appearance of fasc. 3. On the reception of MM see C. J. HEMER, *NT* 24 (1982) 99-104.

⁽⁴⁾ E.g., διῶσχυρίζομαι, for which see now my *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity. A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri published in 1977* (North Ryde, N.S.W. 1982) 39.

⁽⁵⁾ E.g., πεντάκις: see *New Docs*, 1977, 106.

⁽⁶⁾ E.g., ὀρθρίζω: see now *New Docs*, 1976 (North Ryde 1981), 43.

⁽⁷⁾ Because the fascicles were reprinted unchanged in the one-volume edition some of the early entries were already out of date by 1930. Cf. HEMER (above, n. 3) 114-115, points 2, 4.

An indication of the amount of new material becoming available, as well as of older documents being reassessed, may be gained from the two volumes of *New Docs* to have appeared so far. In the vicinity of 10,000 texts (nearly all inscriptions and papyri, and nearly all Greek) were culled for the drawing together of *New Docs*, 1976 and *New Docs*, 1977. These two volumes reflect the fruit of publication for two years only out of the half-century since MM appeared in complete form.

ry occurring in the NT, it is now potentially misleading. It is in the unfortunate position of being accorded greater authority than it now deserves, given the multitude of new documentary texts published since 1930. To the question, therefore, whether the work of Deissmann and MM is sufficiently complete, whether documentary sources have yielded their full potential as a resource for LXX and NT philology (particularly in the question of vocabulary), the answer is a decided 'No'.

Deissmann's view of the level of writing of the NT has certainly been subject to modification. Particularly is this the case with his assessment of Paul's letters: there is a vast difference in kind between Philemon and Romans (at least ch. 1-15), and the latter ought to be considered — on his criteria⁽⁸⁾ — as an epistle rather than a letter. Further, the conclusion which Deissmann drew about the social level of the early Christians from his observation of the parallels between the NT and documentary texts, is now in considerable doubt owing to sociological perspectives being brought to bear upon the NT and the debate they have occasioned over the last quarter-century⁽⁹⁾. Deissmann made his view explicit throughout *LAE*, e.g., "By its social structure Primitive Christianity points unequivocally to the lower and middle classes"⁽¹⁰⁾; that the earliest Christians were "men of the non-literary classes has been so often indicated in these pages from a variety of points of view that I should have no objection if this thesis were described as a main feature of my book"⁽¹¹⁾. A major fallacy in his argument is that he did not take sufficient account of the fact that a considerable proportion of the writers of (e.g.) papyrus private letters were individuals whose status and rank ensured that they are not to be identified with the poor, the 'lower classes', the majority of whom will have been illiterate. The occurrence of orthographic forms considerably at variance with Attic and Atticising norms provides no proof *per se* of a low level of literacy⁽¹²⁾.

⁽⁸⁾ *LAE* 227-251, especially 239-240 (on Rom). For the view that this level of writing is more akin to technical, sub-literary prose (*Zwischenschichtsprosa*), see L. RYDBECK, *Fachprosa, vermeintliche Volkssprache und Neues Testament* (Uppsala 1967). Cf. E. A. JUDGE, *JAC* 15 (1972) 30-31.

⁽⁹⁾ See particularly E. A. JUDGE, *The Social Pattern of Christian Groups in the First Century* (London 1960), and several of his articles, including: "The Early Christians as a Scholastic Community", *JHR* 1 (1960) 4-15, 125-137, reissued in German with revised notes in W. A. MEEKS (ed.), *Zur Soziologie des Urchristentums* (Munich 1979) 131-164; "St. Paul and Classical Society", *JAC* 15 (1972) 19-36; "The Social Identity of the First Christians: A Question of Method in Religious History", *JHR* 11 (1980) 201-217. Note also A. J. MALHERBE, *Social Aspects of Early Christianity* (Baton Rouge 1977). The important series of articles by G. THEISSEN, beginning in 1974, has been collected in his *Studien zur Soziologie des Urchristentums* (Tübingen 1979 — *non vidi*); several have now been translated into English under the title, *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity* (Edinburgh 1982).

⁽¹⁰⁾ *LAE* 7; his n. 1 on that page says that the whole of *LAE* is 'an illustration' of this sentence.

⁽¹¹⁾ *LAE* 290. Other comments in *LAE* relevant to this hypothesis may be found at 6 n. 1, 8, 9, 55, 62, 144, 159-160, 174, 241, 246-247, 272, 299, 338, 339, 340, 385, 394, 395, 396, 466.

⁽¹²⁾ For examples of private letters from 1976 and 1977 publications see

Two recent books provide an opportunity to assess how lasting has been the impact of Deissmann's thesis about the language of the Greek Bible. The focus of one is upon NT vocabulary, that of the other is upon the lexicography of the LXX (and, in particular, the Pentateuch). Each holds a fundamentally different view about the correctness of Deissmann's conclusion, that the Greek of the Bible reflects contemporary *koine*.

II

The most recent book by N. Turner, *Christian Words*⁽¹³⁾, is explicit in its intention to 'turn the clock back' in the study of NT vocabulary to the pre-Deissmann era. Granted that the book is not intended for academic study alone — so the publisher's 'blurb' — nevertheless Turner is explicit in seeing this work as a rounding-off of his two previous volumes in J. H. Moulton's *Grammar of New Testament Greek*⁽¹⁴⁾. His introduction makes clear that he realizes thoroughly what he is trying to do: 'Christian' words are "Greek terms which...the first believers devised for themselves", or words already in use which acquired "a deeper sense and a new consecration within the Christian vocabulary" (pp. ix-x). The distinction between Biblical and secular Greek is explicit throughout the book⁽¹⁵⁾. Although he acknowledges that the papyri and inscriptions do shed light occasionally on usage in the NT, Turner's consistent emphasis is on how little they have aided our understanding of NT usage (pp. xi-xii). "The early Christians had their own form of speech, and I account it to be as 'sacred' in vocabulary as I found it in syntax and style" (p. xi).

Turner's decision to take little account of non-literary evidence is borne out strikingly by his bibliography. Apart from the fact that editions used of classical authors are too often wildly out of date (e.g., those of Aeschylus and Menander), volumes of *BGU* are listed only up to 1933; *P. Oxy.* only to 1927 (vol. 17; by the late 1970s well over 40 volumes had been issued in that series). The only epigraphical corpora included are *CIG*, *IG*, *OGIS* and *SIG*.

New Docs, 1976, 13-21 (14 is in Latin), 83-85; *New Docs*, 1977, 20, 21 (cf. 22), 97, 102, 103.

⁽¹³⁾ Edinburgh 1980. The review by J. WELCH, *Bib* 64 (1983) 139-140, is far more generous than the book deserves.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Vol. 3, *Syntax* (1963), vol. 4, *Style* (1976); the former is excellent in general, the latter very disappointing. It is not only in these books that this view is held: it has been Turner's approach in all he has published. At *ExpTim* 76 (1964) 45 he mentions that this has been his position since 1945.

⁽¹⁵⁾ E.g., 3-4, s.v. 'adoption'. A tripartite distinction occurs frequently too: secular/Biblical/Christian Greek (e.g., 105, s.v. 'deliverance'). For criticism of TURNER'S approach to 'Deissmannism' over the last 30 years see the recent article by M. SILVA, *Bib* 61 (1980) 198-219. I have confined my attention almost entirely to TURNER'S latest book, published in the same year as SILVA'S article. The present paper complements SILVA'S more theoretical essay, which is concerned with problems of definition (see n. 33 below).

The impression left with the reader is that Turner's use of documentary texts had ceased before the Second War.

The fundamental flaw which vitiates his book is the claim implied throughout that the Christians invented the word if it is nowhere attested except in the NT. How fallacious this view is may be seen at a glance from his entries on (e.g.) ἀνεμιζόμενοι (119) and ταρταρώ (210). On this basis other theologically quite innocuous words, such as δι᾽ ὁμοθυμαδόν and ὁρθορῶ, could also be 'sanctified' as 'Christian' words but for the fact that there are now documentary attestations for each⁽¹⁶⁾. I do not wish to deny that Paul (and others, but he pre-eminently) made imaginative, figurative use of quite ordinary words. But that it was done on the scale Turner urges, and by so many writers of disparate literary skill *because* they were Christians, involves misconceiving seriously the way a writer writes unless he is merely eccentric.

In emphasizing the debt of the NT writers for vocabulary and usage to the LXX⁽¹⁷⁾, Turner suggests that research has moved on since Deissmann and Moulton. This is scarcely fair to the former, in particular; but more than that, Deissmann's *Bible Studies* placed special weight on the light that the documentary texts shed on the language of the LXX⁽¹⁸⁾. What Turner has in fact done is that he has ignored the debt of the LXX translators to 'Egyptian' Greek. In perceiving a debt to the LXX everywhere in NT vocabulary Turner appears on occasions to choose a view which favours his desired conclusion even when the evidence is against it: so on ἀναφέρω in 1 Pet 2,5 (Turner, 82, where Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, 88-89, is rejected in favour of the LXX as the source of the usage). Another example to illustrate this propensity in his book may be seen in his treatment of λύτρον (105-107), where he rejects Deissmann's view of λύτρον in the NT being linked with its epigraphical attestations in contexts concerned with the ransoming of slaves⁽¹⁹⁾. Turner's argument thus appears to be verging upon the claim that if a word occurs in the LXX and 'secular Greek' the former is to be preferred as the source for the NT usage. To take this last word, λύτρον, however: as Turner notes, it occurs in the LXX as a translation for several Hebrew words. But he does not address himself to the question, why the LXX translators chose this word for their version. Surely no minor factor in their consideration will have been its currency in the *koine*, to which the

⁽¹⁶⁾ See nn. 4 and 6 above. At NT 16 (1974) 151 n. 1 TURNER is more circumspect in his approach to such words.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Contrast the warning note of J. A. L. LEE that "the vocabulary that the LXX and NT have in common is less than is often supposed. In particular it is to be noted that words common to both often vary considerably in regard to their uses" (*A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* [Septuagint and Cognate Studies 14; Chico 1983] 9; cf. 45).

⁽¹⁸⁾ *Bible Studies*, x; cf. 72, where he speaks of "...the value of the Egyptian papyri and inscriptions for Septuagint research".

⁽¹⁹⁾ *LAE* 327-330, especially 327-328; cf. *New Docs*, 1977, 58, where MM's entry for the word is shown to be seriously deficient even in terms of its own time.

inscriptions bear witness. That little or no link exists between the Greek of the LXX and other *koine*-period works is the inference Turner means us to draw — I presume — from his so-frequent use of the term 'Jewish Greek'. Thus, to take merely two of the first words which he discusses, βδέλυκ-τός/βδέλυγμα are "most likely coined in Jewish Greek by way of the LXX" (p. 2); παντοκράτωρ "seems probably to be a coinage of Jewish Greek, for there are comparatively few secular examples apart from the magical papyri, and these show Jewish influence" (p. 5)⁽²⁰⁾.

A small number of other examples is listed, with comment as sparing as possible, as further illustration of the view that Turner's approach is extremely defective.

- (a) ἄγγελος (14-17): no mention is made of the *aggelos* inscriptions from Thera and the extra dimension they possibly provide for our understanding of NT usage⁽²¹⁾.
- (b) ἀδελφός (56-57): Turner dismisses what he claims is the sole example of ἄ. used in a pagan religious association with the meaning 'brother'. But cf. *New Docs*, 1977, 14, where an example or two from Rhodes are given — merely the observations of this year's culling — and 60, where the presence of other familial words such as μήτηρ in the context of an association adds a degree of weight to the expectation — in itself plausible anyway — that familial terminology should be employed in associations of various kinds. *New Docs*, 1976, 18, may well afford further confirmation in the letter reprinted there, as does the Latin text quoted in that entry.
- (c) ἐκκλησία (68-71): a particularly inferior entry. Note, e.g., the third paragraph on p. 68 which reveals a surprisingly poor understanding of the 'Classical' Greek world. Turner's view of the use of this word in Acts is, frankly, dumbfounding (69, para. 1):

It was in St. Luke's earlier years as a Christian, while he was writing the diary which is thought to have been incorporated in the complete edition of Acts, that he used the word *ekklēsia* in the secular way to which he was accustomed (Acts 19 [vv. 32.39.41]). I presume that *his language subsequently suffered a change in the direction of a new dialect*, in which Christians had made *ekklēsia* a special name for the believing brotherhood. [My emphasis.]

Turner's discussion of ἐ. illustrates clearly, too, that he makes far too little differentiation between the usage of the various NT authors (69, paras. 3, 4).

⁽²⁰⁾ This comment on Jewish influence in the magical papyri is far too facile.

⁽²¹⁾ Brief comments in DEISSMANN, *LAE* 279-280 and n. 1; more recent treatment by M. GUARDUCCI, in *Mélanges helléniques offerts à Georges Daux* (Paris 1974) 147-157, who suggests that these epitaphs indicate the pagan character of the angels carved on them. This view is at best doubtful: it is more appropriate to see them emanating in a Christian milieu. Cf. J. and L. ROBERT, "Bulletin épigraphique", *REG* 89 (1976) 520; note also their earlier review of Guarducci's work on this material, *REG* 54 (1941) 106.

- (d) εὐαγγέλιον (190-191): Turner notes the existence of *OGIS* 458 (Priene, 9 B.C.), in which Augustus' birthday is said to inaugurate *euaggelia* for the world. But "the first Christians would not be aware of so definitive a use of the word and would be likely to avoid the association even if they were" (190).
- (e) κύριος (257-260): here Turner appears to be endeavouring to ward off the possibility that the NT writers availed themselves of words used in contexts other than 'pure', biblical Greek⁽²²⁾. Thus he seeks to persuade the reader that an LXX background provides a 'sufficient origin' for the use of κύριος as a 'name' (*sic*) of Jesus (259):

If the Christian title did come from Hellenistic paganism, then pagan influence seeped into the brotherhood at a curiously early stage, for the title was used in the first days of the Church — as witness St. Paul's letters to the Thessalonians. Is it conceivable that, so soon, pagan influences from Egypt were affecting a primitive and largely Jewish community? (*ibid.*)

The views in this sort of statement (e.g., the implied monolithic purity of Judaism and its imperviousness to the winds of Hellenism)⁽²³⁾ take little account of the reality. To take up Turner's example, was it only Christians of Jewish origin that Paul addressed in Thessalonike? Even if Paul were consciously thinking of the LXX background, could he count on convert readers there from outside Judaism making the same link? Surely in the first instance the sort of association they might more reasonably be expected to make is the use of κύριος (and θεός) as designations of the Caesars in inscriptions, and the occurrence of κύριος as an epithet for gods⁽²⁴⁾. It makes of Paul a very naïve 'apostle to the gentiles', and renders the success of his Mission unaccountable, if we are to suppose that his non-Jewish converts were expected to understand his statements entirely within the framework of LXX terminology.

Turner has sought to revive what had been — before Deissmann — the consensus view of the nature of the Greek of the NT. It was against just such a perspective that Deissmann had argued, whereby "the notion of the Canon is transferred to the language [of the NT] and so there is fabricated a 'sacred Greek' of Primitive Christianity"⁽²⁵⁾.

⁽²²⁾ There are some exceptions to this. Thus, s.v. μυστήριον, TURNER acknowledges (284) that "on occasions the first Christians borrowed a term from the contemporary Mystery religions". Cf. 404, s.v. παρουσία. Such concessions are all too rare in the book. At *NT* 16 (1974) 160 TURNER cautions NT researchers "against relying over much on secular parallels" because of "the uniqueness of the Biblical Greek vocabulary".

⁽²³⁾ For some comments on the hellenization of Jews at Rome and elsewhere see *New Docs*, 1976, 67, 68, 69, 111.

⁽²⁴⁾ See *New Docs*, 1977, 4, 6.

⁽²⁵⁾ *Bible Studies*, 65. SILVA (above, n. 15) summarises DEISSMANN'S position well: "While certain peculiarities of NT Greek give it away as having been written by Semites, they are not so many that the language should be 'sharply distinguished' from non-Biblical Greek or 'isolated' from the normal tasks of Greek philology" (200).

III

Reference was made above at n. 17 to J. A. L. Lee's study on the Greek of the Pentateuch: it is to this book that we now turn. Printed with a 1983 date on it, the book is in fact an unrevised retyping of his doctorate presented in 1970. This fourteen year lag is certainly a misfortune, even if it is true that progress in LXX studies goes by steps, not large leaps. One might have hoped that, as a minimum, its bibliography could have been updated at the same time as the indexes were added⁽²⁶⁾. The book is reproduced from a very accurate typescript; but it is a comment on the publisher, not the author, that books in this form carry the psychological danger of not being taken as seriously as they may deserve.

In this book Lee argues that the Greek of the LXX — and in particular the Pentateuch, which provides his focus — reflects the vernacular *koiné* of III B.C. Egypt. The series of chapters is excellently thought out to build up this case by study of various aspects of the language: 'The vocabulary of the Pentateuch: a general survey' (ch. 3); 'New semantic developments in old words' (ch. 4); 'New formations' (ch. 5); 'New words' (ch. 6); 'Innovation and obsolescence' (ch. 7); 'Lexical evidence for the date of the Pentateuch text' (ch. 8). The 30 pages preceding this are given over to an introduction (ch. 1) and a chapter on 'The nature of LXX Greek' (ch. 2). Both these are quite excellent in their clarity of discussion for one who is wanting a 'way in' to reading on LXX philology. Ch. 2 is particularly damaging to the view that the Greek of the LXX (and NT) was a special Jewish-Greek: the works of H. S. Gehman and N. Turner are subjected to critique here⁽²⁷⁾. An especially persuasive element in his argument against Jewish-Greek is his demonstration that the LXX translators deliberately avoided a literal rendering of Hebrew phraseology and employed idiomatic Greek which did not alter the sense of the passage (24-29)⁽²⁸⁾.

A newly-observed example of this phenomenon may be mentioned here. A recently-published nursing contract (Arsinoe, 9/8 B.C.) makes a useful addition to the small number of such documents already known⁽²⁹⁾. These texts

⁽²⁶⁾ Some important reference tools relevant to his study have not been drawn upon though they appeared in the late 1960s. One may single out here S. DARIS, *Spoglio lessicale papirologico* (3 vols; Milan 1968).

⁽²⁷⁾ TURNER has by now, of course, published more considerably (and moved to a more extreme position) than GEHMAN, but that LEE'S primary focus is upon the latter was not an inaccurate perception of their relative importance in 1970. On GEHMAN, see more recently SILVA (above, n. 15) 210-213.

⁽²⁸⁾ It should be allowed, however, that to show that the LXX reflects vernacular *koiné* does not prove that so-called 'Jewish-Greek' did not exist. The LXX translators will have been well-educated, an élite, who knew *koiné* well (cf. LEE, 35) and naturally drew upon it in their translation. But if some kind of Semitized Greek dialect did exist it would be indicative, surely, of a ghetto mentality; and it is on this score, therefore, that its existence is most unlikely.

⁽²⁹⁾ *Ed.pr.*: S.M.E. VAN LITH, *ZPE* 14 (1974) 145-162, col. 2, ll. 45-64; repr. in *SB XII.2* (1977) 11248, and (with translation and comment) in *New Docs*, 1977, 1.

reflect a situation where a person has picked up an infant exposed to die and, in order to rear the child as a slave for economic gain, has found a woman to act as wet-nurse for a specified period. The use of the verb ἀναιπέομαι at l. 61 of taking up a foundling to rear it is just what we find at Exod 2,5-10 in the story of the taking up of the baby Moses by Pharaoh's daughter. It should be noted that at Exod 2,5-10 ἀναιπέομαι renders two different Hebrew verbs: *lāqah* (2,5), and the very rare *māshāh* (2,10) for which the LXX employs no standard equivalent in the few places where it occurs. It is virtually certain, then, that the LXX rendering at Exod 2,10 reflects the terminology of the Hellenistic nursing contracts. The chain extends further, for the wording of Stephen's speech at Acts 7,21 draws upon this Exodus passage: Pharaoh's daughter ἀνείλατο αὐτὸν καὶ ἀνεθρέψατο αὐτὸν ('had him nursed'). Here, then, is a telling instance of the debt of the NT to the vernacular *koine*, mediated via the LXX.

After the first two chapters Lee's book has plenty of meat to yield up to concentrated attention, but it must be said that it is not easy reading. This is due in part to Lee's very laconic style, partly also to the lack of running heads in the book (a not-unimportant fault in the publisher's lay-out), but particularly to the requirement to have LSJ and MM open beside one when considering Lee's argument at many points. For when he provides documentary attestations for words he does so by saying (34, n. 3; but this *caveat* is easy to overlook) that exact references may be found in LSJ and MM, and mostly thereafter says simply that a word occurs (e.g.) "apart from the LXX, only in Lucian ... and a papyrus of ii/iii A.D." (41). This sort of feature in the thesis deserved revision to allow the book to stand on its own.

One impressive feature about Lee's work is the care with which he has almost always chosen papyrological examples which date to within the century when he suggests the LXX Pentateuch was written. To find documentary attestations of words half a millennium removed from one's focus of discussion is sometimes hard enough; but to home in on III B.C. examples, as he so frequently does, provides useful undergirding for his argument in general, and in particular for ch. 8 (on the date of the Pentateuch). That said, ch. 8 is not the most successful in the book. In arguing for an early *terminus ante quem* for the text of the Pentateuch Lee's sample of words discussed is too narrow (words for 'see', 131-140; words for 'donkey', 140-143; some further examples are treated very briefly on 144). The treatment of these two word groups is excellent, and they are very different examples in type, but they hardly constitute a sufficient sample to do more than point us in the direction where the *terminus* may lie; and Lee's conclusion is therefore inevitably somewhat general (143-144: "our text of the Pentateuch is older than about the middle of the second century B.C.", 143). It is not impossible that a single word may help to narrow down the date, some technical term which can be shown historically to have come into use during a particular reign of one of the Lagid rulers. Lee's discussion of τοπάρχης (98) hints at this, but he does not explore sufficiently the potential of such words⁽³⁰⁾.

⁽³⁰⁾ By analogy G. M. BROWNE has demonstrated in *JCS* 1 (1976) 53-58 that the *Sortes Astrampsychi* originated in Egypt during III A.D., on the basis of the

A further merit of Lee's book which may be singled out here is the amount of methodological discussion provided *en passant*. Ch. 2 *passim*, on the debate over Jewish Greek / Egyptian Greek as the basis of the LXX, is not the only place where this occurs (one may mention particularly his discussion in that chapter of 'important words', 22-23); but see also e.g. 34, n. 2 on 'poetic' words, and 128, n. 20 on *variatio* in the LXX. Lee has pursued this interest in method in LXX lexicography in an article published between the completion of the thesis and its publication as a book: *RB* 87 (1980) 104-117 on "Equivocal and stereotyped renderings in the LXX" ⁽³¹⁾.

Those indexes which have been provided are quite full enough, though it would have been easy — and increased the book's utility — to asterisk all words in the Greek index where corrections to entries in the lexica (especially LSJ) are provided. Lee addresses himself to this vis-à-vis LXX usages recorded in LSJ Suppl. in *Glotta* 47 (1969) 234-242. One index which should have been included, however, is Biblical references (including NT, for Lee offers interesting comments on several NT books and word usages: 86 n. 2; 87; 124 n. 11; 127 n. 17; 133-134; 142 n. 36).

New attestations of uncommon words are being found in documentary sources every year, as also occasionally are extremely rare or new words. But unless those who work in Biblical Studies read the papyrus and epigraphical publications this information will rarely be drawn to their attention; for it is not realistic to expect a major re-edition of works like Bauer's *Lexicon* or *MM* every few years. Nor is it common for classicists editing these texts to make explicit verbal affinities with the Greek Bible. A revision of *MM* is a major project being undertaken at Macquarie University, and the publication of the *New Docs* series is intended both to make it visible and to indicate how needful it is. In the dozen or so years since Lee's thesis was written a number of the words he dealt with have been attested in documentary sources or studied in more detail. This is not to say that his treatment of Pentateuch lexicography is outdated, since the focus of *New Docs* (like *MM*) is heavily towards the NT; but the mere handful of examples listed below does serve to emphasise that new attestations are surfacing constantly.

- * ἀρχι- compounds (LEE, 48, 96 n. 16); cf. *New Docs*, 1977, 2
- * βουνός (LEE, 114-115); cf. C. J. HEMER, *NT* 24 (1982) 121-123
- * γένημα (LEE, 99); cf. *New Docs*, 1977, 2
- * διαφωνέω (LEE, 82); cf. *New Docs*, 1977, 1
- * ἐξαποστέλλω (LEE, 93-94); cf. *New Docs*, 1977, 43

presence of the words βουλευτής and δεκάπρωτος within the text. On the *sortes* see *New Docs*, 1977, 8, which considers a number of aspects about oracular questions and answers, including the way in which Christian examples are modelled closely upon pagan counterparts.

⁽³¹⁾ E. Tov's important recent article in *HTR* 75 (1982) 429-448 on "Criteria for evaluating Textual Readings" is of relevance for NT no less than for LXX methodology.

- * μέρος (LEE, 72-76; cf. id., *Antichthon* 6 [1972] 39-42); cf. *New Docs*, 1977, 2⁽³²⁾
- * ὀρθρίζω (LEE, 46); cf. *New Docs*, 1976 (1981), 43
- * σύγκρισις (cf. LEE, 78); an article, by C. J. FORBES, on this term in Paul, *koine* orators, and writers like Plutarch is forthcoming in *NTS*: 'Comparison, Self-praise and Irony: Hellenistic Rhetoric and the 'Boasting' of Paul'.

In discussing the contribution that the LXX makes to our knowledge of *koine* Greek, and by showing that the LXX reflects vernacular lexical meanings occurring in the papyri, Lee's claim that the LXX is representative of vernacular Greek occasionally needs the qualification added, 'in Egypt, at least' (e.g. 137). For some regional differences in usage were inevitable owing to indigenous influences. Since Lee has confined himself very largely to papyrus parallels we can only draw conclusions with confidence about the situation in Egypt. It is a pity that more epigraphical documentation was not drawn on. *New Docs*, 1976 and 1977 provide not a few instances of words occurring in the NT whose meanings are elucidated by inscriptions (see especially *New Docs*, 1977, 58, on λύτρον).

IV

The books of Turner and Lee have been used here as representatives to illustrate that there are two very divergent paths in the study of the language of the Greek Bible. One of these is demonstrably a cul-de-sac, and its proponents do not inspire confidence in their methodology or scientific approach to the philological questions with which they are grappling⁽³²⁾. Lee's study, in contrast, shows that there is plenty of valuable harvest still to be reaped by those who follow the road which Deissmann surveyed. That this holds good for LXX philology, Lee has shown; but no less it the case for the much more frequently-trodden NT path. The socio-historical conclusions which Deissmann drew from his lexicographical research may be open to some serious doubt; but his demonstration that 'Bible' Greek is vernacular *koine* remains of permanent value.

Macquarie University
New South Wales
Australia

G. H. R. HORSLEY

⁽³²⁾ It may be noted here that neither MM nor BAUER'S *Lexicon*² (s.v., 16) provides documentary illustration of this usage.

⁽³³⁾ In this connection SILVA'S general comments on 'dialect' and 'bilingualism', (above, n. 15) especially 204-209, make useful reading.

The Unity of the Bible

The appearance of *The Great Code: The Bible and Literature*⁽¹⁾ is a publishing event of the first magnitude, not merely in North America and in the English speaking world but anywhere where there exists serious interest in literature or even curiosity about the place of the Bible in the literary, cultural, and religious universe. By any standard Northrop Frye is not only among the leading literary critics in the world. He possesses a theological background, a consuming interest in the Bible in itself and particularly in its influence on the symbolic consciousness of the western world. It is not amiss, therefore, for the serious student of the Bible to summarize Frye's expansive treatment of the Bible and to propose some critical reactions.

I.

What distinguishes *The Great Code* as a gigantic act of interpretation is not simply the amplitude of the effort to locate the Bible within the more comprehensive literary world. Frye goes beyond the accepted premise that the Bible is the *mythos* (narrative) with the most pervasive influence on the western imagination to the more difficult task of articulating a conceptual framework by induction, one which will lead "to the open community of vision, and to the charity that is the informing principle of a still greater community than faith" (227). This hoped for transformation of consciousness stands in an antiphonal relationship to a critical treatment of language and the ways in which the Bible structures its language. First, therefore, Frye examines the order of words (Part One) and then the order of types (Part Two). The chiastic configuration of the chapters is revealing: language I, myth I, metaphor I, typology I; typology II, metaphor II, myth II, and language II.

II.

If the literary critic asks, "In what does the unity of the Bible consist?" the answer to the strictly literary question must be, "in its ordering of words under the rubrics of typological, metaphorical, and stylistic unity which com-

⁽¹⁾ Northrop FRYE, *The Great Code: The Bible and Literature* (New York 1982). All references to this book will be indicated in the text by Arabic numerals.

prehends an encyclopaedic and imaginative vision of the world from creation to apocalypse". The Bible is an archetypal structure, an "encyclopedic form" (315). Because of the diversity of human authorship, the long period of oral and written composition, its variety of literary genres, the continual but elusive redactional procedures, the tribal origins, not to mention a frequently patriarchal and wilful God, the imaginative unity of the Bible is not merely astonishing but perhaps unique.

The major verifiable agent of Biblical unity is its typological formation and construction. This creative influence is not confined to the evident and open instances of typology easily accessible to the beginning theological student, the explicit examples of typology known to all. Frye speaks rather of a typological framework which he summarized earlier in an article on Milton.

Inside the story of Adam is the story of Israel, who falls from a Promised Land into the bondage of Egypt and Babylon. Besides being a second Adam, Christ is also a second Israel who wins back, in a spiritual form, the Promised Land and its capital city, Jerusalem. In this capacity, the story of the Exodus or deliverance of Israel from Egypt prefigures his life in the Gospels⁽²⁾.

To this earlier insight Frye now adds a "sequence of phases... of Biblical typology, each phase being a type of the one following it and an antitype of the one preceding it" (106). The phases are: creation, revolution (exodus), law, wisdom, prophecy, gospel, apocalypse. The phases are warranted in Frye's understanding of polysemous meaning which does not violate the Miltonian (and earlier, the Antiochene) principle that passages of scripture should not have diverse meanings. Nor does polysemous meaning lead to capricious, arbitrary, or eisegetical interpretation. Polysemous meaning does not establish a different sense but rather "different intensities or wider contexts of a continuous sense, unfolding like a plant out of a seed" (221). This reminds the reader of the well-known citation of Vincent of Lerins quoted in Vatican I, "*Crescat igitur... et ...proficiat... intelligentia, scientia, sapientia...*" (DB 1800 [3020]).

While Frye's interpretation here is traditional in its dialectical development of the old literal, allegorical, moral, and anagogic levels of interpreting a Biblical text, what is original with Frye is the conceptual control he exercises by combining types and antitypes into a spiralling and continuous process in which each type is absorbed into a subsequent antitype including and heightening its predecessor. This escalating process constitutes the order of types. Unfortunately, only in passing does Frye piquantly note that systems of faith "have always tended to make themselves antitypes of Biblical narrative and imagery..." (226). Similarly brief and equally provocative is Frye's observation that the typological drive begins with the text itself, for "every

⁽²⁾ Northrop FRYE, "The Typology of Paradise Regained", *Modern Philology* 52-53 (1954-1956) 229.

text is the type of its own reading. Its antitype starts in the reader's mind..." (226). One here wishes that Frye would say more about the legitimacy or necessity of such mental transpositions which raise the still unresolved question of what is constitutive and what is consecutive in this long historical procedure, a point to which I shall later return.

It is important to recall that Frye has long held that the typological mentality pervading the Bible derives from faith, hope and vision which, as Eliade has pointed out, transforms "History into theophany⁽³⁾". In varying degrees this vision, seemingly proximately produced by faith and hope, has effected all of western culture and has experienced a secular and deadly metamorphosis in Marxism. In many ways Frye is reminiscent of Joachim of Fiore. But Joachim dealt much more explicitly with the delicate problem inherent in typological vision, that is, the constant subsuming of the present moment, which is an antitype, to a forthcoming antitype, in which case the present antitype becomes a type. The relentless logic of Joachim made him fare far better at the hand of Dante than of either Aquinas or ecclesiastical authority. To my knowledge the only recent theological effort to unravel this riddle has been made in a quite different context by Jürgen Moltmann.

III.

While typology, particularly in its spiralling phases, gives the Bible thematic unity, recurring imagery furnishes a protracted motival unity readily perceptible to the assiduous reader. Reading, particularly in its centripetal dimension, must continually reproduce the hermeneutical circle, that is, understanding the parts through the whole and the whole through the parts. Earlier and in diverse places Frye had spoken of the city, the garden and the sheepfold as organizing metaphors. He speaks now more comprehensively of "phase of imagery in the history of Israel" (142), the "pastoral, agricultural, and urban" (142). Frye devotes two pages to an outline of Apocalyptic Imagery and its counterpart, Demonic Imagery. The divine, angelic, paradisaical, human, and vegetable categories of apocalyptic imagery each have a class and a corresponding individual. For instance, the paradisaical category is the Garden of Eden, individualized as the Tree and Water of Life. Its demonic counterpart is the wasteland or sea of death and its group and individual parody is the Tree and Water of Heathen Power (166-167). Frye explicitly points out that these classifications echo the Great Chain of Being and thus are based on the two fundamental assumptions of the chain: hierarchical progression and ascending plenitude (165).

The effect of recurring imagery, for example, garden, tree, water, sheep, shepherd, vineyard, is to stimulate the memory, to produce a sense of continuity, to unify the reader's literary experience "through language" (167). Dragon, blood, wine, harvest, vine, stone, city, path, highway, road, sky — all

(3) Mircea ELIADE, *Images and Symbols* (Kansas City 1961) 164.

of these motifs appear in varied Biblical disguises. All the motifs are assembled in the Book of Revelation where Christ is the One God, the One Man, the One Tree, the One Temple — the incorporation of divinity, humanity and of the realms of animal, vegetable and mineral reality. To this Frye might have added, a point at which he frequently hints, the One Light and the One Word echoing, permeating, and transforming the first creation account into the New Creation. This centripetal unity becomes transparent by intensive and repeated centripetal reading.

IV.

Finally, the imaginative unity of the Bible is visible in particular stylistic characteristics, that is, certain modes of conception and literary execution which are constant and pervasive. Space allows only some superficial observations on a subject amply treated elsewhere⁽⁴⁾.

Biblical narrative is laconic, utilizes repetition, either of phrases, key words, images, actions or patterns. Images not only recur but are subtly modified, as, for instance, the fiery stream of I Enoch 14 and Daniel 7,9, developments of Ezekiel 1, becomes the life-giving water flowing through the new Jerusalem. The transformation to water not only connotes life but also suggests nearness to God. Repetition, economy, and creative transformations are evident. There is likewise recurrent symmetrical design of which one instance will suffice. In Judges, "Israel, in whom the spirit of apostasy appears to be remarkably consistent, deserts its God, gets enslaved, cries to its God for deliverance, and a 'judge' is sent to deliver it" (40-41). Narratives are symmetrical with an easily discernible pattern. Later the evangelists shape the events of Jesus' life into the manner in which they read the Old Testament as prefiguring his life (41). This is repetitive symmetry of a larger scale and quite convincingly demonstrates that anyone who would understand the New Testament must first understand the Old Testament.

Frye even sees the possibility of repetitive symmetry governing the very arrangement of the New Testament. There is the possibility of "the Gospels corresponding to the law, the Acts to the histories, the Epistles to the prophecies and Revelation, which owes so much in spirit to Daniel and the Chronicler's romanticized story of the temple, to the Writings" (207). Perhaps even John's Gospel, "intended to be the Christian antitype of the Genesis account of creation" (207) may have been designed as the first book of the Christian Canon. The literary devices of repetition and symmetrical design, accompanied by foreshadowing and heightening, are the stylistic convention by which the ultimate control of God over history is affirmed. Each instance of literary design and stylistic convention attaches the transient mo-

⁽⁴⁾ Cf. Robert ALTER, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York 1981); J. P. FOKKELMAN, *Narrative Art in Genesis* (Amsterdam 1975); Christopher ROWLAND, *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (New York 1982).

ment into a larger constellation of theological meaning and prefigures the final triumph of God's design over human wilfulness — a dialectic that was somberly introduced in the second creation narrative.

I can mention only in passing Frye's observations about Biblical resonance. While the Bible manifests a calculated indifference to secular history as such (because of the writers' convictions of God's ultimate control?), the Bible speaks of events and situations that are universal, ones that always occur. A particular historical event, whether it be David and Nathan or Jesus and the leper, "acquires a universal significance" (217). So true is this that the winepress of Isaiah 63 enters human consciousness through "The Battle Hymn of the Republic" and the literary world through *The Grapes of Wrath* (217). And the same sort of resonance appears in two controlling Biblical metaphors: the legal metaphor and the royal metaphor. The legal metaphor has its origin in a portrayed fall, one that is considerably developed in the Pseudepigrapha, and depicts "human life as subject to trial and judgment..." (110). The royal metaphor assumes "that we are all members of one body" (99), a metaphor that was elaborated by Ignatius of Antioch and received institutional fulfilment in the social bodies of State and Church (99).

It is not necessary here to exemplify stylistic characteristics Frye notes in common with nearly every exegete, i.e., paratactic structure, irony, personification, hyperbole, metonymy, paranomasia, alliteration, aposiopesis, pleonasm, etc. We may simply note in passing that the misunderstanding of parallelism and antithetical rhythm probably led the Matthaean redactor to a misunderstanding of Zechariah 9,9. This led the redactor in Matthew 21,2 to have Jesus instruct his disciples to bring not only an ass but also a colt. The study of style inherent in literary criticism is here cathartic.

V.

Even from this jejune analysis of typological, metaphorical, and stylistic characteristics it is evident that the Bible is constituted by an amazing series of intricately woven relationships. The imaginative unity of the Bible occurs not primarily through a correspondence to external events nor even by a subsequent emergent dogmatic unity but rather through the light of creative faith, vision, and a writing style matching faith and vision. Hopefully the perception of this artistic counterpoint may lead "to the open community of vision, and to the charity that is the informing principle of a still greater community than faith" (227) in which "the body of human imaginative response" (231) becomes more accessible, compelling, and universal.

Are there observations and additions that might be made? If we agree with Frye's observation, which is historically verifiable, that "...in our critical experience some verbal structures keep responding to progressive critical treatment..." (1), then it is not out of place to proffer some personal reflections generated by Frye's engaging and compelling enterprise.

VI.

First of all, the community of vision proposed by Frye is founded on the unity of the Bible, that is the intrinsic unity of what have hitherto been called Old and New Testaments. Realistically this unity involves a completely different relationship of Jews to the latter half of the book and of Christians to the first part. This point has begun to receive attention both on the part of Jewish and Christian scholars well-known to readers of this journal.

Secondly, Frye has made a very good case for the primacy of the literary operation in understanding the Bible. This emphasis on critical reading implies that the outcome of literary criticism is not to uncover external decoration or ornamental form, much less a facade such as Potemkin created for Catherine the Great in her travels, but to disclose that the theological and religious meaning of the Bible is inextricably bound up with its literary character. On the other hand, one might suggest that the literary dimension of the Bible and the imaginative unity constituted by typology, imagery, symmetrical design and coherent style is grounded not merely in a vision of "what might be" but in a conviction of what actually was and is. This is to affirm that God was and is the Lord of history. The Bible does not at all disdain history but rather affirms it by seeing more in merely secular events than is immediately apparent and therefore in its own way creating and making history. Form and content coalesce.

The Bible is what Frye calls "deeply serious" (221). This is true both of its content and of the convictions which motivated writers, redactors, and compilers. From the earliest discernible strata we note a serious commitment to a tradition, a conviction of the existence of a God who speaks, a pervading persuasion that it is the responsibility of the believer to take seriously divine interventions, to seek continually the hand of God. We have not in the Bible simply a powerful poetic vision but a prior and powerful existential act of faith which sees recurring apotheoses in history. Frye hints at this when he asserts that the Bible is more than literature. One wishes that Frye would have elaborated this point more fully.

Thirdly, Frye's reinstatement of polysemous meaning is not merely a literary nicety or conservative gesture. What appears in written form is the tyrannical claim of a spiritual perspective. This spiritual perspective becomes what Ellis calls "a charismatic exegesis that becomes part of the divine revelation itself⁽⁵⁾". That is to say that the Bible is pervaded by the conviction of the presence and activity of God. This religious conviction, articulated in varied forms of theological discourse, is most apparent in the

⁽⁵⁾ E. E. ELLIS, *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids 1978) xvi. Cf. also Paul S. MINEAR, *New Testament Apocalyptic* (Nashville 1981) and Richard M. DAVIDSON, *Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical Typos Structures* (Berrien Springs, Michigan 1981).

charismatics that wander through the Bible. Literary criticism alone does not bridge the gap between the charismatic and non-charismatic interpreter.

Fourthly, while it is true that in the last twenty years or so, historicity, at least in its more crass form, is no longer a central issue, much more nuanced articulation is needed to define what exactly is meant by "historical reminiscence" (39) or the similar phrase of Alter, "historicized prose fiction⁽⁶⁾". The Bible remains a form of historiography, but not a very simplified one. It is a construct of spiritual exploration in very concrete historical conditions. Hopefully Frye's next volume will shape the relationship between literary criticism and historical criticism.

Fifthly, the Bible, by historical circumstance, by the power of its imagery, by the transparent convictions of its writers, by its constitutive influence on two large groups, Jews and Christians, finds itself in a conventional category of fairly recent vintage, that of literature. I, for one, should like to see Frye develop what exactly we mean when we say the Bible is more than literature. Surely part of the answer lies in the primitive belief that these books were sacred, and they were sacred because inspired. To this belief in inspiration, however it technically be defined, we owe a good deal of the force that the Bible has exercised on believers. Both text and reader emerge and develop in interpretative communities which themselves are governed by open, public, and conventional points of view. But to accept the Bible as more than literature — and this seems to be its very *raison d'être* — requires a serious commitment of self. Can this level of commitment and conviction be reached by comprehending the imaginative unity of the Bible? Is this the higher level of differentiated consciousness, the community of vision of which Frye speaks? How precisely does this community go beyond faith? What form should the emergent community take? Basically, I suspect, I am asking how exactly are literary criticism, historical criticism, theological criticism, and faith related? The broader question is how are the Biblical realities and ecclesial community connected? How does Frye's proposed community of vision extend itself beyond the isolated literary critic or the professional scholar?

Sixthly, we may surely agree with Frye when he observes that the literary critic intends the kind of knowledge that Plato ascribes to *nous* — knowledge of things, as opposed to *dianoia* — knowledge about things. The quest for knowledge of things permeates the Bible. The quest for a new level of being likewise pervades the Bible and is penetrated with an ever increasing knowledge which is really acknowledgement of God. The first creation account (Genesis 1,4) begins with the creation of light by a transforming word. The final book, Revelation, ends in an idealized city, one which "has no need of sun or moon to shine upon it, for the glory of God is its light, and its lamp is the Lamb" (Revelation 21,23). This metaphorical light, the transformation of all being, is the consistent message of the apocalyptic prophets who people the Biblical theatre and who base their communication on a vision of "a new heaven and a new earth" (Revelation 21,1). Prophetic Apocalyptic blends

(6) ALTER, *Art of Biblical Narrative*, 24.

vision, language and community. Frye's search is for the imaginative unity in an ancient book and rests upon the hope of a vision which may again create community. I should like to see the author in his forthcoming work not only elaborate the theological presuppositions inherent in such a hope but likewise make some attempt to clarify not only how comprehensive this community would be but how exactly is the Bible, as literature, related to other sacred literatures and to the imperious claims they likewise make? This is not only to develop theological criticism but to engage in, or at least to suggest, comparative criticism. Surely the title in this latter half, "*and Literature*" cannot be limited to western literature. Such comparative criticism, properly the work of the history of religions, would then open up the larger question of truth.

If, as I am convinced, the study of religions involves four dialectically interrelated operations: literary criticism, historical criticism, comparative criticism, and theological criticism, Frye's theological background, not to mention ministerial antecedents, make him a very logical candidate to expand topics only fleetingly alluded to in this splendid book. If religion may be classified as a heuristic vision and if the human imagination is a common endowment, does the heuristic and imaginative vision portrayed in the Bible have thematic or motival similarities to other visions? Or does this vision, as many indeed would hold, comprehend, subsume, and transcend all other visions?

University of Alberta
Religious Studies
Edmonton, Alberta T6G 2E5
Canada

P. Joseph CAHILL

On the Identity of Jesus⁽¹⁾

Jack Dean Kingsbury is a Synoptic scholar who has his priorities right: first use literary techniques to decide what the Synoptic gospels mean as they stand, and then try to solve the complex tradition-critical problems which their similarities and differences and historical setting inevitably create. Kingsbury's book on the Christology of Mark is like a breath of fresh air for one who has recently dipped into a contemporary German work on the Synoptics, where the priorities are not right and the author goes solemnly nattering down a literary cul-de-sac.

Kingsbury's book basically uses literary techniques to decide what Mark's Gospel says about who Jesus Christ is (although attention is also given at the end to Jesus Christ in Matthew and Luke)⁽²⁾. He says little about tradition-critical problems or about historical setting. But what he has done is sound: he clearly sets out problems and solutions (clarity is one of his strong points, aside from a few overly-long sentences).

Two introductory parts serve as preambles to the central section of the book: a study of modern views about the "Messianic secret" from Wrede to the present (pp. 1-23) and a study of modern views about "corrective Christology", also from Wrede to the present (pp. 25-45). Kingsbury thinks that the secret of Jesus' identity in Mark is not, strictly speaking, a "Messianic" secret but the secret that Jesus is the "Son of God", and a variety of devices are employed in Mark to keep the secret hidden in full or in part. As for "corrective Christology" (Mark wrote his Gospel to "correct" the title "Son of God" by using the phrase "Son of Man" and the theology of the cross), Kingsbury is sceptical of the basic importance of the "divine man" theme of Hellenism for the interpretation of Mark. This means that he is sceptical about the use of the "divine man" theme to illumine the phrase "Son of God" and hence is sceptical about the theory which says that the cross and the phrase "Son of Man" are used by Mark to correct such an understanding. Instead of approaching the Gospel of Mark primarily from the standpoint of tradition criticism, he opts for literary criticism: what the text means as it stands⁽³⁾.

⁽¹⁾ Jack Dean KINGSBURY, *The Christology of Mark's Gospel*. Philadelphia 1983. Fortress Press.

⁽²⁾ Ibid., "Beyond Mark: Matthew and Luke", 176-179.

⁽³⁾ "The task is not to read the Gospel in the light of a reconstruction of pre-Markan traditions or of the alleged heresy of the Marcan church, but to follow the contours of Mark's story. My principal (though not exclusive) method, then, is that of literary criticism, and by this I mean no more than that I shall endeavor to read Mark by looking to the story it tells for the primary clues of meaning" (KINGSBURY, *Christology*, 45).

With the third part of his study ("The Christology of Mark: The Davidic Messiah-King, the Son of God", pp. 47-155) Kingsbury comes to the heart of his case: the terms "Messiah", "Son of David", and "King of the Jews (Israel)" are insufficient for expressing Mark's deepest understanding of Jesus; that understanding is adequately conveyed only by the phrase "Son of God", which expresses what God himself thinks of Jesus. The motif of the secret is used by Mark as a device for showing how human thinking about Jesus is brought into alignment with divine thinking⁽⁴⁾.

"Son of God" is one of the two major aspects of Jesus developed by Mark. The other is "Son of Man". The two are considered by Kingsbury to complement each other⁽⁵⁾. "Son of God" has an inward orientation, focussing on Jesus' identity; "Son of Man" has an outward orientation, focussing attention on Jesus' relations with the "world"⁽⁶⁾. Given this analysis, Kingsbury draws two important conclusions:

... precisely because the function of the title of the Son of Man is not to explicate for the reader "who Jesus is", two important consequences for Mark's story follow: (a) the Son-of-Man sayings do not infringe upon, or undermine, the motif of the secret of Jesus' identity; and (b) the identity Jesus bears in Mark's story is unified: Jesus of Nazareth is the Davidic Messiah-King, the Son of God, or, more pointedly, the royal Son of God⁽⁷⁾.

This is a good book. In fact, it is a very good book. It clarifies the state of the question by getting priorities right and by contributing valid insights into Mark's Christology. The decision to assign priority to literary techniques and not to tradition criticism is a major step toward eventually getting at what Mark was driving at in his text as it stands. Undoubtedly tradition criticism and historical criticism can sharpen this understanding, but only if they have a solid base to build upon.

One of the valid insights which seems particularly helpful is Kingsbury's view that "Son of God" and the associated royal terminology be kept distinct from "Son of Man": "If one looks at the way in which Mark works with... titles, one can discern a clear division among them... the division is between 'the Son of Man', on the one hand and 'Messiah', 'King of the Jews (Israel)', 'Son of David', and 'Son of God' on the other"⁽⁸⁾. Kingsbury could have expanded on this division by noting what seems to be a bipartite pattern in the gospels: 1) the use of "Son of Man" by Jesus in a dialogue and 2) the use of some royal messianic title by an interlocutor of Jesus⁽⁹⁾.

Kingsbury's insistence on the division between royal titles and the "Son of Man" title is crucial for his theory that they are mutually complementary: he divides that he may unite. The Son-of-God aspect concentrates on the

⁽⁴⁾ Ibid., 141.

⁽⁵⁾ Ibid., 174-175.

⁽⁶⁾ Ibid.

⁽⁷⁾ Ibid., 175.

⁽⁸⁾ Ibid., 55. Cf. also pp. 111 and 161.

⁽⁹⁾ Cf. *Bib* 64 (1983) 143.

identity of Jesus and the Son-of-Man aspect highlights the element of conflict between Jesus and the leaders of the Jews⁽¹⁰⁾.

The present writer would like to take advantage of Kingsbury's splendid contribution to make several suggestions. A good place to begin is the baptism account, and particularly Mark 1,11 and the words "You are my beloved son", which are attributed to God. Kingsbury understandably and correctly makes much of the verse, pointing out its relevance for the title "Son of God"⁽¹¹⁾. He states that the phrase "beloved son" is "most probably" from Gen 22,2 and 22,12⁽¹²⁾. He duly notes the connotation "only" for the Greek word "beloved" (ἀγαπητός)⁽¹³⁾. But he does not exploit this information. He notes that ἀγαπητός is used to translate the Hebrew *yhd* in several texts of the Septuagint (Judg 11,34; Amos 8,10; Zech 12,10; Jer 6,26), but does not note that in each instance the term is used in the context of the death of an only child⁽¹⁴⁾. This identification of Jesus as one destined to die seems crucial for Mark's understanding of Jesus, for the words are repeated as God's words at the transfiguration (Mark 9,7) and in the parable of the vineyard and the wicked tenants as the words of Jesus himself (Mark 12,6)⁽¹⁵⁾. Thus from the beginning of the public ministry Jesus is presented as having a God-given awareness of himself as the Son of God destined to die. And here is where Kingsbury's insistence on the distinction between Jesus' royal titles (culminating in "Son of God") and the "Son of Man" title seems to illumine the text: the reader is informed at the very outset that Jesus as God's Son is destined to die, but the other protagonists in the Gospel account have to learn this only with great difficulty. The transfiguration account links God's words with the risen Jesus, and Jesus restricts this revelation to the chosen three apostles until after the resurrection of the "Son of Man" — Jesus here implicitly connects the suffering of death which the Son of God has to undergo with the title "Son of Man"⁽¹⁶⁾. Finally, Jesus' identity as an only son destined to die is made public in his parable of the vineyard and the wicked tenants; his enemies, the "chief priests and the scribes and the elders", learn of it from his own lips (Mark 11,27; cf. 12,1)⁽¹⁷⁾. At Jesus' trial this interpretation is used by the high priest to destroy him⁽¹⁸⁾.

⁽¹⁰⁾ KINGSBURY, *Christology*, 175.

⁽¹¹⁾ Ibid., 48-49, 65-67.

⁽¹²⁾ Ibid., 65.

⁽¹³⁾ Ibid., 65, n. 86.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Ibid. Cf. R. LE DÉAUT, "La présentation targumique du sacrifice d'Isaac et la sotériologie paulinienne", in *Studiorum paulinorum congressus internationalis catholicus*. 1961. Vol. 2 (AnBib 18; Rome 1963) 570.

⁽¹⁵⁾ The words are spoken by the owner of the vineyard, i.e., God, in the parable given by Jesus. Kingsbury stresses the interconnection between the baptism scene, the transfiguration, and the parable of the vineyard and the wicked tenants (116-117).

⁽¹⁶⁾ Mark 9,9. In his discussions of this verse Kingsbury does not succeed in integrating the reference to "Son of Man" into his treatment of this title and of the title "Son of God". Cf. his part four, "The Christology of Mark: The Son of Man", 157-176.

⁽¹⁷⁾ KINGSBURY, *Christology*, 118.

⁽¹⁸⁾ Ibid., 118-119.

Thus the divinely-given identification of Jesus as God's Son destined to die is at the heart of Mark's Christology. The point Mark is making is this: that Jesus, *although* he is royal Messiah, king, David's son, and even God's Son, is destined to die. The implied opposition between the two notions is what Paul called a "scandal" for the Jews⁽¹⁹⁾. When Peter first hears it he cannot bear the thought⁽²⁰⁾. And this would seem to be the grievance of the high priest at the trial: he challenges Jesus in terms of his identity as the Messiah, the Son of the Blessed One, and Jesus affirms that identity and links it with the Son of Man, the figure from Daniel who inherits the kingdom through suffering⁽²¹⁾. It is the linking of Messiah and suffering which the high priest characterizes as blasphemy and which the Sanhedrin cannot abide. Thus for the reviewer Kingsbury's contention that the titles "Son of God" and "Son of Man" are distinct is an insight absolutely necessary for understanding what Mark is saying, even though Kingsbury does not develop the implicit opposition between them.

Kingsbury maintains that the titles "Son of God" and "Son of Man" are "complementary"⁽²²⁾. True. But the situation seems to be more complicated than Kingsbury indicates. For Mark does not seem to be working with a single meaning for either "Son of Man" or "Son of God", nor does he view these titles as symmetric parallels. "Son of Man" is the subject term of the two, and indicates concretely Jesus, the Nazarene; "Son of God" and the related royal terms are the predicates which, when affirmed of the subject terms, caused such horror and scandal. Inasmuch as it functions as a subject term, "Son of Man" is never predicated of Jesus, as Kingsbury observes⁽²³⁾. But this does not preclude its having its own range of meaning. At its most basic level that range begins, probably, with "Son of Man" as a circumlocution for "I"⁽²⁴⁾, bringing with it the connotation of the humanity, the weakness, the limitation of Ezekiel's "Son of Man", and serves as a foil of Jesus' works done with authority⁽²⁵⁾. This range of meaning culminates in Jesus' revelation of himself before the high priest as Daniel's "Son of Man", with the connotation of death and the inheritance of the kingdom⁽²⁶⁾.

⁽¹⁹⁾ 1 Cor 1,23. It would be impossible to present the implied opposition more succinctly than Paul presents it in this verse: "...but we proclaim a crucified Messiah..." (ἡμεῖς δὲ κηρύσσομεν Χριστὸν ἐσταυρωμένον).

⁽²⁰⁾ Mark 8,32.

⁽²¹⁾ Mark 14,61-64.

⁽²²⁾ KINGSBURY, *Christology*, 174-175.

⁽²³⁾ *Ibid.*, 160.

⁽²⁴⁾ *Ibid.*, 166. Although showing a certain sympathy for the view which holds that "Son of Man" is a circumlocution for "I", Kingsbury holds firmly to the view that it is a title, apparently convinced that it cannot be both. Cf. *ibid.*, 166-168.

⁽²⁵⁾ *Ibid.*, 164-165.

⁽²⁶⁾ Kingsbury is unsatisfactory in discussing Mark 14,61-64 from the standpoint of the "Son of Man" (122-124). He wants to make the phrase a title, but a title which does not serve to identify who Jesus is as the title "Son of God" serves. What he is groping for here is the distinction between "Son of Man" as pertaining to the designation of Jesus as subject, and "Son of God" pertaining to the designation of Jesus as predicate.

"Son of God" is the predicate of the two titles, facing off with the subject title "Son of Man". The richness of the royal titles associated with it suggests its range of meaning. "Son of God" is, of course, the weightier by far of the two titles "Son of Man" and "Son of God", and it is here where the true mystery of Jesus' identity lies, as Kingsbury so well implies. But it is a weakness of Kingsbury's approach not to distinguish different levels of meaning in this title, as he failed also to do for "Son of Man". "Son of God" can be a purely honorific title to indicate extraordinary divine gifts to a human, and it is surely in this sense that the centurion standing before the dead Jesus must have used the term, presuming that the incident portrayed at Mark 15,39 is historical; and nothing beyond this surely must have been in the mind of the high priest when he questioned Jesus as to his identity as "Son of the Blessed One". But is this all that *Mark* intends by the title? This is a question which Kingsbury does not explicitly tackle and as a result his book is strangely inconclusive on this level. Did Mark intend the readers/hearers of his Gospel to believe that Jesus' basic identity was the same identity which the Council of Nicea affirmed when it stated that Jesus as Son was fully divine?

To answer this last question Kingsbury would seem to have to dig even deeper into Mark's Gospel and wider too. For example, the way Jesus is described as he walks on the water to meet the disciples is important, and the meaning of "Lord" as well⁽²⁷⁾, and the revelation of Jesus in the Markan passion narrative as "King".

In *The Christology of Mark's Gospel* Kingsbury has shown that he has his priorities straight and his insights functioning. A second confrontation between him and one of the most intriguing documents in the history of world literature is now in order.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Rome

James SWETNAM, S.J.

⁽²⁷⁾ Cf. Mark 12,35-37. Kingsbury (*Christology*, 108-111) does not regard the word κύριος as a title of Jesus in Mark, and hence seems to undervalue the importance of this passage for understanding who Jesus is in Mark's Gospel.

RECENSIONES

Vetus Testamentum

Richard Elliott FRIEDMAN, *The Exile and Biblical Narrative. The Formation of the Deuteronomistic and Priestly Works* (Harvard Semitic Monographs 22). 151 p. Chico, California 1981. Scholars Press.

Une caractéristique domine cet ouvrage: la clarté et donc la simplicité, non seulement de l'exposé de la thèse, mais de la thèse elle-même. Étudiant l'impact de l'Exil sur le caractère de l'histoire deutéronomiste et sur l'œuvre du Sacerdotal, l'auteur annonce ainsi les choses: «That there were two editions of the Deuteronomistic history, the first Josianic, the second Exilic», et: «That there were two principal stages of the Priestly work, the first in response to the Josianic edition of the Deuteronomistic history, the second exilic». Après quoi il étudie l'œuvre du Deutéronomiste exilique puis celle du rédacteur sacerdotal exilique.

C'est naturellement le point de vue théologique qui précise les perspectives générales des quatre grandes catégories de rédacteurs, aboutissant à l'idée du Dieu caché. Les caractéristiques nouvelles du récit naissent évidemment de cette théologie ou plus exactement de ces interventions théologiques assez ponctuelles qui, à vrai dire, empêchent de parler d'une forme de récit typique du Deutéronomiste comme du Sacerdotal. A ce titre l'auteur a donc raison de parler d'impact ou d'influence plutôt que de véritable genre littéraire.

C'est avec beaucoup de finesse et d'acuité qu'il mène son enquête, reprenant l'idée de Dieu, le thème de l'Alliance ou la conception de «Tabernacle» issue de l'épreuve de l'Exil comme de la théologie. Prenant appui, au départ, sur les travaux et positions de M. Noth et de G. von Rad, il ne cesse de confronter les apports plus récents en matière de littérature deutéronomique surtout (N. Lohfink, B. Halpern, etc.), mais aussi en matière de concepts, tel celui d'Alliance. Ainsi s'imposeront les deux éditions deutéronomiques et leurs reprises sacerdotales sous Josias et sous l'Exil.

Certains s'étonneront sans doute de voir reçue comme un acquis définitif et donc comme non remise en question l'existence des documents J et E et de leur synthèse. Étant donné le sujet de cet ouvrage, l'acuité du regard que nous avons signalée, il eût été intéressant que l'auteur confrontât ses thèses avec celles qui mettent justement en question l'existence de ces deux documents et notamment du document E: la prise en compte des thèses de

R. Rendtorff en particulier aurait été du plus haut intérêt sans pour autant mettre en question le projet même de son travail, ni peut-être même l'essentiel de ses conclusions. Mais il aurait sûrement pris une autre tournure.

Chemin de la Blaque, B.P. 200
13606 Aix-en-Provence - Cedex
France

Pierre GIBERT

Leslie MCFALL, *The Enigma of the Hebrew Verbal System*. XIII-259 p. Sheffield 1982. The Almond Press.

Many students of Hebrew, after studying the language for a while, begin to feel that they finally understand the verbal system. Then they come across some passage which makes them fear they must have missed something important that day they skipped class or the times their mind wandered. There are usages that simply don't fit the standard theories about tense and aspect that they thought they had learned. Such students can console themselves that the fault is not always with them and for proof they can read Leslie McFall's 1981 Cambridge doctoral dissertation directed by Prof. J. A. Emerton and now published as *The Enigma of the Hebrew Verbal System*.

The book discusses the principal theories concerning the Hebrew verbal system published between 1827 and 1954, with special focus on the problem of the *waw* conversive/consecutive. McFall examines and evaluates the work of: S. Lee (1827), H. Ewald (1834), I. Nordheimer (1841), S. R. Driver (1874), W. Turner (1876), J. A. Knudtzon (1889), H. Bauer (1910), G. R. Driver (1936), and T. W. Thacker (1954). These authors represent six approaches to the problems of the verbal system. Those readers under time constraints can consult the summary evaluation on pp. 176-185.

McFall does drop hints and make suggestions about where future theories should move, and he offers clear criticisms of the various approaches discussed, but his work is mainly and intentionally historical. So he offers no original, detailed hypothesis of his own. Nor does he discuss theories advanced after 1954. He does not examine, for example, Jerzy Kuryłowicz's chapters on "The West Sem. Verbal System", and "The 'Aspects' of the Sem. Verb" in his *Studies in Semitic Grammar and Metrics* (Wrocław 1972). Nevertheless his limits are understandable because it probably is true that theories advanced before 1954, especially those of Ewald and S. R. Driver, form the paradigms operative in the minds of most Old Testament scholars.

There is one area, though, where McFall does make an original contribution. In an appendix (189-210) he discusses in some detail the phenomenon of the tone shift in the first and second person m. sg. suffix forms with prefixed *waw*. He concludes that the shift is neither phonemic nor determined by syllabic conditions. He argues rather that it is syntactically conditioned.

This review is not the place to solve the enigma of the Hebrew verbal system! But a few general comments are in order. First of all, the book makes for interesting reading. Anyone who has spent much time working Hebrew would enjoy reading about some important attempts to clarify our understanding of the language. Several aspects of the book will lessen the enjoyment, however. The inking of the pages is uneven, and this, combined with Hebrew characters written rather than typed, creates pages often difficult on the eye and sometimes downright messy. The author also uses a numbering system (e.g. 1.3.8.18, 1.3.8.19, 1.3.2.6.4) throughout which is unnecessary and annoying. But perhaps these observations are simply, echoing Dr. Johnson, "the petty cavils of petty minds". Let us move on to more substantive matters.

We do not completely understand the Hebrew verbal system and all its nuances. McFall, however, makes the enigma at times seem greater than it really is. In his critique of various theories, for example, he emphasizes that every tense and practically every mood are required to translate the five Hebrew verbal forms. Both aspects or modes action are also so required. He even has an appendix (#4) listing instances where the same *qtl* verb has been translated by a past tense in one place and a future in another in the Old Testament. This approach is too nihilistic. Context is a legitimate factor in grammatical analysis and not simply a last resort. In Old English, for example, there was no form of the verb comparable to our future tense formed with the auxiliaries *shall* and *will*. Old English speakers usually employed the present tense and let the context indicate that the action was to take place sometime in the future. It is unrealistic to expect any Hebrew verbal theory to be completely context clean.

At times McFall also seems uncomfortable with the speculation involved in linguistic explanation. In discussing Thacker's theory he states that the "chief disadvantage with this approach is that it is possible to advance more than one theory that is capable of explaining the evidence. Though one scholar may argue more plausibly than another, there is inevitably something speculative about the theories" (167). This was also one of his criticisms of the composite language theory of G. R. Driver (151). Unfortunately, though, such speculation is simply in the nature of the beast. The discoveries and discussions of the last half century or so do give some controls (see W. L. Moran, "The Hebrew Language in its Northwest Semitic Background", in: G. E. Wright, *The Bible and the Ancient Near East* [Garden City 1961] 54-72, esp. 61-66) but when dealing with Semitic languages one still moves into conjecture sooner than with other historical languages. Does, for example, the use of the imperfect after 'āz in a past punctual sense go back to an original preterite *yaqtul* (itself the basis of the converted imperfect) or does 'āz itself go back to a verb which has degenerated into a temporal particle so that we are dealing with what was originally a complementary imperfect? (McFall emphasizes the importance of distinguishing between narrative and direct speech styles, but other distinctions are also crucial: independent vs. dependent uses, and, of course, poetry vs. prose.) Would that we had more evidence!

Because a high degree of conjecture is unavoidable, it goes without say-

ing that theories should be consonant with sound linguistic principles. Of course exceptions may have to be made. An appeal to "reverse" analogy is usually not applauded in historical linguistics, but it does seem to have played a role in the development of the converted perfect sequences of Hebrew, where the perfect takes on not only the future function of the imperfect but also its habitual past tense functions (i.e. *kataba wa-yaktub* helped lead to *yaktubu wa-kataba*).

The usages we don't understand are, relatively speaking, few. But, as in other sciences, a new paradigm will take over when, with simplicity and elegance, it can include within its explanatory power a previous paradigm's exceptions. The one who develops the paradigm will need not only a sound knowledge of the Semitic languages but a specialist's knowledge of linguistics, the combination exemplified in Thomas O. Lambdin's "The Junctural Origin of the West Semitic Definite Article" (in: H. Goedicke, *Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William Foxwell Albright* [Baltimore 1971] 315-333).

McFall's book doesn't attempt to give us a new paradigm, but it is a clearly written competent, interesting analysis of how we've ended up where we are.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta 25
00187 Roma

Robert LAWTON, S.J.

Novum Testamentum

Eduard SCHWEIZER, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Das Neue Testament Deutsch 5) 263 p. Göttingen, 1982.

E. Schweizer has a very brief introduction which covers only six pages. He grants that Luke used Mark and "Q" as sources and in his commentary directs his attention to what Luke does with a pericope. He takes for granted that one knows the explanations of the material that Luke shares with Mark and Matthew. Like all commentators he grants that Luke has material proper to him. For this material Schweizer feels that probably Luke has one unified written source, but the Infancy Narrative presents a separate problem. However, the contention that Luke was responsible for most of the material proper to him and for the changes in "Q", and thus knew an oral tradition is according to Schweizer, not very probable because of the tensions between the text and Luke's redactions. Nor, according to Schweizer, is it likely that the Luke who wrote Luke-Acts was a companion of Paul since Acts in many ways does not correspond with what we know from Paul's letters. Perhaps, the "we" passages, the designations of cities where Paul stopped and the observations made about them, may go back to Luke and thus

led to his identification as the author. Nothing in Luke-Acts really proves that the author was a doctor. Luke-Acts may have been written at Antioch, and their author knows and uses the LXX and its style. He may have been a "God-fearer", but he certainly was not a first generation Christian. His Gospel was written after 70. Since he is very interested in Paul and yet does not know of his letters, he could not have written after 100 A.D. Nor does the evidence show that he knew Matthew's Gospel or clearly reveal Luke's *Sitz in Leben*. Schweizer's introduction ends with a very brief bibliography which does not include such classics as H. J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts* [London, 1927] and *the Beginning of Christianity* I-V [London, 1920-1923].

The majority of the book consists in Schweizer's exposition of Luke's Gospel. He provides a German translation of each passage, a reflection on the sources and redaction of its text, his explanation and concluding remarks. The book also contains a very brief (three pages) "*Rückblick*", an index of names and topics and a list of abbreviations.

As I indicated in my review of J. Roloff, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (NTD 5; Göttingen 1981), the books in this series would benefit from a longer introduction which included a summary of the given author's theology. Not only would this help the respective scholar organize his commentary better, but it would alert the reader to the main concerns of each New Testament author. True, Schweizer has compensated for the lack of such a summary of Luke's theology with his concluding remarks at the end of each pericope and with his *Rückblick*. Nonetheless, the absence of such a summary is particularly felt in the case of a scholar like Schweizer whose reflections would be particularly perceptive.

The purpose of such reviews as this in *Biblica* is to interact in an original and sustained way with the book being reviewed. Yet, in doing this, the fact that Schweizer has written a fine commentary should not be missed. He has done a vast amount of thinking and of reading and brings considerable expertise to the task. He pays careful attention to the text and is well aware that Luke, who writes about fifty years after Jesus' resurrection, is addressing his Christian reader. Schweizer argues his opinions well, and his readers will gain many insights into Luke's Gospel.

There are two major areas in which I would disagree with Schweizer's interpretation of Luke's Gospel. The first relates to Luke's use of sources. It is extremely important in the question of sources to ask with exactly what of precision one claims that someone has or has not used a source. Even more important is to ask what importance should be attached to the fact that Luke did opt to use a given verse or pericope. Does it now become his thought? If not, what can be said about it? What does Luke's changing of a mere word or something like word order show? Such questions have so often been raised about source criticism that redaction critics have felt more loyal to the New Testament writers when they move to composition criticism or to literary criticism, as this latter term is used in language departments of American universities.

More disconcerting is that Schweizer (e.g., p. 255) does not hold that one finds in Luke a clear unbroken line of salvation history from the Old Testa-

ment to Jesus and from him to the end of all time. I believe that Schweizer draws this conclusion because he does not realize that for Luke the Christians are the true Israel. Perhaps, the easiest passage in which to view this Lucan position is Acts 3,22-23: "Moses said, 'The Lord God will raise up for you a prophet from your brethren as he raised me up. You shall listen to him in whatever he tells you. And it shall be that every soul that does not listen to that prophet shall be destroyed from the people'". Peter makes this statement in the middle of the speech which he presents to the Jews in Jerusalem as a result of John's and his healing of the crippled man at the Beautiful Gate of the Temple. Almost all Lucan scholars would grant that Luke wrote the speeches in Acts. So, Luke has Peter set down a new criterion for belonging to the people. One must listen to the prophet Jesus in whatever he says, or that person will be cut off from the people. Luke has redefined Israel. This is why, as Schweizer himself several times correctly notes, Luke distinguishes between the Jewish people and their leaders. G. Lohfink proves particularly helpful on this point in "Hat Jesus eine Kirche gestiftet?" *TQ* 161 (1981) 81-97 and in *Die Sammlung Israels: eine Untersuchung zur lukanischen Ekklesiologie* (München 1975) 61-62, 91-99.

Schweizer also points out that Luke begins to eliminate the Pharisees from the list of Jesus' opponents and offers the explanation that, since in Acts 26,4-8 Paul defends what he does as the logical results of being a Pharisee, Luke prepares his readers for this argument. What Schweizer failed to do is to realize that in his defense before Festus and Agrippa II (Acts 26,1-32) Paul, when he claims that all that he is doing is living, believing, and hoping as a Pharisee should, identifies himself as a Christian. The significant verses read, "And Agrippa said to Paul, 'In a short time you think to make me a Christian!' And Paul said, 'Whether short or long, I would to God that not only you but also all who hear me this day might become such as I am — except for these chains'" (Acts 26,28-29). Luke identifies the Pharisee Paul as a true Christian. In fact, Paul in this speech represents all Christians who are the true Pharisees because of what they believe.

There are a number of additional arguments which can be adduced from Luke-Acts to demonstrate that Luke held the Christians to be the true Israel, but this review hardly constitutes the appropriate place to consider them. However, once one realizes that Luke sees no break in Israel's history, there is little problem in drawing the accurate conclusion that Luke's main theological theme is that God continues to bring salvation to his people, Israel, who are now the Christians and that he does this particularly through Jesus. Moreover, if the Christians are the true Israel, there can be less intense concern about the need to establish the precise moment of the founding of the Church, but scholars of Luke-Acts will also have to be more careful not to dismiss the concept of Church from Luke's thought. This Church is portrayed with the images and descriptions proper to Israel.

There is another point of Lucan theology, not unrelated with what was just considered, about which I would disagree with Schweizer. He contends that Luke has no clear teaching about Christ. This contention certainly has validity in that it indicates that Luke points out a number of things about Jesus, among which would be that he is "a prophet", "the prophet", "Sav-

ior", "Leader", "Suffering Servant", "King", "Lord", "Christ", "Son of Man" and "Son of God". But the clarity in all this comes from the realization that Christ fulfills for the Christians what God did and does through these various functions and figures for Israel. But the one image which appealed most to Luke is that Jesus, just as his father, is the savior of those who are disadvantaged in any way. In view of the numerous examples which Luke has of Jesus' interactions with the less significant members of the human family, who by the way include the persecuted, it is difficult to see why Schweizer will not grant this Lucan emphasis.

The risen Christ is more active in Luke-Acts than Schweizer maintains, but there is no need to address this point here since I have presented this position extensively elsewhere ("Activity of the Risen Christ in Luke-Acts", *Bib* [1981] 471-498). Also, as regards the Lucan presentation of the risen Christ, "witness" is a technical term for Luke. He never uses it of a woman (I suspect that the Jewish demand for male witnesses influenced him). For Luke a "witness" is someone who has seen the risen Christ and so proclaim the central tenet of Christianity, Jesus' resurrection. No one living today could qualify as a Lucan "witness".

I doubt that Schweizer is correct when he maintains that Luke has a separate source for his passion narrative. In Luke's passion narrative, A. Vanhoye (*Structure and Theology of the Accounts of the Passion in the Synoptic Gospels* [Collegeville 1967]) could have alerted Schweizer to Luke's emphasis on the historical and personal.

Some other questions are in place. How aware is Schweizer of the metaphorical meaning of wealth and poverty in Luke-Acts? How much *real* proof is there for the theories that Luke views Jesus at times as the suffering, innocent, just man and that he writes his Gospel for leaders of the Christian community? Finally, Schweizer frequently uses the word, "free", which does not distract from his interpretation of Luke, but it is more due to Schweizer's own spiritual life and experience than to Luke's thought. On the whole Schweizer has written a fine commentary. Although apparently intended for a German audience, this commentary will prove useful to all scholars and students of Luke-Acts.

Saint Louis University
St. Louis, MO. 63108
U.S.A.

R. F. O'TOOLE, S.J.

Gerd LÜDEMANN, *Paulus, der Heidenapostel*, Band 1: *Studien zur Chronologie* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 123). 301 p. 23,9 × 16,0. Göttingen 1980. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

—, *Paulus, der Heidenapostel*, Band 2: *Antipaulinismus im frühen Christentum* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten

und Neuen Testaments 130). 322 p. 23,9 x 16,0. Göttingen 1983. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

What Gerd Lüdemann is attempting in his important trilogy on Paul and his work is nothing less than a complete re-examination of the possibilities and tensions created within early Christianity by the Pauline Gentile mission. His first volume (now also in English: *Paul, Apostle to the Gentiles: Studies in Chronology* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984]) investigates certain fundamental issues of Pauline chronology along lines proposed especially by the American scholar John Knox. L.'s basic argument is that the conference at Jerusalem between Paul, Barnabas, and the Jerusalem "pillars" was in reality a response to the success of Paul's Law-free Christian mission in Asia Minor and Greece and not, as Luke would have it (Acts 15), the prelude to this mission. The second part of the trilogy discusses the negative reaction of Jewish Christianity to Paul's ministry. Here L. argues that the anti-Paulinism which characterized all shades of opinion within the Jerusalem Christian community prior to 70 A.D. continued to influence many different Jewish-Christian groups during the following century. The third and final volume is to be a reconstruction of Paul's thought on the basis of the new chronology.

L.'s title for his first volume, *Studien zur Chronologie*, reflects his belief that the sources permit the construction of only a partial Pauline chronology. L. correctly insists, that is, that the chronological framework of Acts be treated with systematic scepticism. Paul's letters therefore constitute the only primary source for questions of chronology. L. therefore largely passes over certain of the usual Pauline chronological topics, topics such as the dates for Paul's Caesarean and Roman imprisonments. For such issues investigators will have to turn to studies like Robert Jewett's *A Chronology of Paul's Life* (Philadelphia 1979) to see what might be said.

In accord with his methodology L. begins the first major section of his book (pp. 58-151) with a thorough exegetical analysis of the most important evidence provided by Paul himself on the historical sequence of his activities, Gal 1,6-2,14 and the references in his various letters to the taking up of the collection of money for Jerusalem. When L. finally does turn to Acts — the second part of the book (pp. 156-206) is principally a study of Acts 18 — he does so in order to recover underlying traditions utilized by Luke. If, but only if, these prove to be in harmony with information given by Paul in the genuine letters, they can then serve further to secure and even to extend our knowledge of Pauline chronology. Of course such a requirement means that L. must ignore all of the information in Acts 19-28 about Paul's later life since here the letters are quite silent. Given the fact, as L. himself insists, that Luke made use of older traditions, this wholesale abandonment of Acts at this point as an historical source seems mistaken. Yet the deeper concern voiced by L. stands: an exegete cannot slide easily and uncritically from Paul's letters to the Lucan "biography" to fill the gaps in Paul's *vita*.

Ironically, however, L. himself derives the three linchpins of his chronology from traditional materials that he identifies in Acts 18. The first of these, the date of Paul's appearance before Gallio at Corinth (51-52 A.D.), is of itself familiar enough. L. contends, however, that this judicial hearing

took place not during Paul's first visit to Corinth but during his final stay just before he departed for Jerusalem with the collection.

A principal reason for this conclusion is provided by the second traditional unit identified by L., Acts 18,18-23. L. makes a strong case that here Luke has made use of an older travel itinerary (18,18 ab + 19 a + 21 c + 22-23 — although 18,23 c ["strengthening the brethren"] seems a Lucan formulation). This records a journey from Greece to Ephesus, Caesarea, Jerusalem, Antioch, Galatia, and west again. What particularly points to the non-Lucan character of this is that Jerusalem is not mentioned by name. Acts 18,22 speaks simply of Paul's "going up" from Caesarea to greet "the church" before continuing on to Antioch. Following E. Barnikol, J. Knox, etc., L. argues that Paul travelled only three times to Jerusalem (see Gal 1,18-19; 2,1-10; Rom 15,25-28). The two further journeys mentioned by Luke (Acts 11,27-30 and either 15,1-29 or 18,18-23) serve his concern to stress Paul's close links with the Jerusalem church and are actually three versions of one event, Paul's second Jerusalem journey. Particularly improbable is any journey after the Jerusalem conference and before the bringing of the collection. If L. is correct, the travel itinerary of Acts 18,18-23 can only describe Paul's journey to participate in the Apostolic conference. If, however, Paul came to this conference *from Greece*, he presumably had already established his Asian, Macedonian, and Achaean churches. Gal provides some evidence of Paul's independent mission activity prior to the conference among Gentiles, if not necessarily in Asia Minor and Greece: Gal 2,1-3 supposes this, and the use of *prosanethento* in Gal 2,6 also points this way. That, argues L., Paul made no mention of his western churches in Gal 1,13-2,14 is because, as H. D. Betz has demonstrated, this section is not a simple biographical statement but the *narratio* portion of a developed rhetorical argument stressing the nature of Paul's relationship to Jerusalem. Matters not germane to this would not have been included.

Acts 18,2, which mentions the expulsion by Claudius of "all the Jews" from Rome and the subsequent arrival of Prisca and Aquila in Corinth, if exaggerated, provides a third piece of tradition useful in anchoring a Pauline chronology. This can only be linked with Paul's initial visit to Corinth, and so L. has strong reason to situate this event as early as he can. If it is true, as he suggests, that Luke may have been responsible for correlating this expulsion with the time of Gallio's proconsulship, the actions taken by Claudius against various Jews in Rome in 41 A.D. (Dio Cassius 60.6.6) do not coordinate well, *contra* L., with Acts 18,2. Especially damaging to L.'s efforts to make use of Dio's account is the fact that Dio specifically says that there was no expulsion on this occasion. L. appeals to a tradition-redaction analysis of the Dio report but his argument seems far-fetched.

L. has produced the following chronology: crucifixion of Jesus—27 A.D., conversion of Paul—30, first Jerusalem visit—33, Syria and Cilicia—34, European mission begins—c. 36, 1 Thess (from Corinth)—c. 41, Jerusalem Apostolic conference (= second visit)—47, return to Galatia—48, Paul at Ephesus—48-50, 1 Cor (from Ephesus)—49, 2 Cor (from Macedonia)—50, Gal (from Macedonia)—50, final visit to Corinth (Gallio hearing)—51-52, Rom (from Corinth)—52, journey to Jerusalem—52, Phil (written during Paul's Roman captivity)—undated.

Problems of course present themselves. L. has to date Jesus' death-resurrection very early to accommodate the rest of the chronology. Indeed, he himself offers an alternative framework in which the crucifixion is dated to 30 A.D., all other events are set three years later, and the appearance before Gallio rather dubiously is assigned to an earlier visit to Corinth, the "painful visit" (2 Cor 2,1; 13,2). 2 Cor 11,32-33/Acts 9,23-25 mention an event quite inconvenient for L.'s chronology, Paul's escape at Damascus from the guards of Aretas IV. Despite L.'s casual dismissal of their case, Jewett and others have argued convincingly that this placed Paul in Damascus c. 37-39 A.D. L. also ignores the list of officials of the Antioch church given in Acts 13,1. This tradition, probably quite reliable, indicates that Paul shared in the leadership of this community, but L.'s chronology leaves little time for this development. L. also believes that the Antioch confrontation (Gal 2,11-14) actually occurred before the Jerusalem meeting (Gal 2,1-10) and was probably its immediate cause. Although it was permissible in a rhetorical *narratio* such as Gal 1,13-2,14 to abandon natural chronological order (so Quintillian 4.2.83-87), it was never, as even L. admits, common procedure. Yet here both Acts 15 and Gal 2 agree in recording a dispute between Paul and Barnabas immediately *after* the Jerusalem conference (Gal 2,13; Acts 15,37-39) and therefore render L.'s theory improbable. L. happily discovers an eleven-year gap between the writing of 1 Thess ("the early Paul") and all of the later letters ("the later Paul"), but why such a gap occurs L. never explains. The "letter fragment" theory for 2 Cor is dismissed by L. without serious discussion. Yet, however answered, this issue cannot be ignored in any thorough treatment of Pauline chronology. Quite unsatisfactory is L.'s own off-hand suggestion, that Titus simultaneously delivered to the Corinthians two letters so jarringly different in tone, 2 Cor 1-9 and 2 Cor 10-13. Finally L.'s reasons for placing the writing of Gal after 1 and 2 Cor are unconvincing, and his statement that Phil was composed at Rome rather than at Ephesus is never properly defended.

Despite such problems this book almost unfailingly proves stimulating and provocative. Aside from a rather flat final section (pp. 213-271) in which L. sought to use Paul's changing eschatological perspectives to further support his chronology, he normally succeeds in gripping the minds of his readers, compelling them to think through anew the basic issues of Pauline chronology even when they find themselves objecting to this, that, or the other point that he advances. Certainly this deserves high praise indeed!

The second volume of the trilogy is not as successful. In this study of anti-Paulinism in Jewish Christianity L. viewed himself as following in the footsteps of Ferdinand Christian Baur. To this end L.'s work begins (pp. 13-57) with a lengthy *Forschungsbericht* in which Baur's groundbreaking insights are highlighted. As early as 1831 Baur advanced the view that there existed in the Corinthian church not only a Pauline party but also a "Petrine" or Jewish-Christian group that accepted the Jerusalem leaders but not Paul as true apostles. Baur at first thought that this factionalism, which occurred also at Philippi and in Galatia, was due to overzealous followers rather than to an actual cleavage between the Jerusalem apostles and Paul himself. By 1845, however, he had concluded that such a cleavage did exist; that there were two basic types of Christianity, the Pauline version and Jewish Chris-

tianity; and that the latter tended endemically to be anti-Pauline. This led Baur to the further conclusion that second-century Jewish Christian groups such as the Ebionites had a closer relationship with early Christianity at Jerusalem than had previously been suspected.

It is this line of argumentation that L. set out to vindicate and to develop. In the first main segment of the book (pp. 59-165) he discusses the anti-Paulinism referred to in the letters of Paul and in older traditions utilized in Acts, and in the second section (pp. 167-286) a series of late-first and second century texts (Hegesippus; James ["c. 100 A.D."]; Justin, *Dial.* 46-47; the Pseudo-Clementine *Recognitions* and *Homilies*; etc.) that shed light on Jewish Christian attitudes toward Paul.

The results of this latter section cannot be said to be striking, although L. does demonstrate in rather convincing fashion that the tradition contained in Eusebius, *HE* 3.5.3 and parr. on the flight of the Jerusalem Christians to Pella provides evidence not for an actual flight from Jerusalem c. 70 A.D. but of the Pella Christians' view of themselves as the true heirs of Jerusalem. L.'s analysis of the various traditions recording the martyrdom of James also is persuasive.

Far more provocative — but more problematic — is the first section. In L.'s view the church at Jerusalem developed steadily in the direction of greater and greater hostility toward Paul, a fact which then explains the persistence of anti-Paulinism in later Jewish Christian texts even when these actually support positions of Paul himself! That, however, this development was quite so straight-line and continuous may be questioned. To be sure, at the time of Paul's arrival in Jerusalem with the collection it would seem that the legal-traditionalists were firmly in control of that church. Using traditions found in Acts 21, L. makes a strong case for supposing that the Jerusalem community rejected Paul's collection and therefore unity with his churches. Yet such a rejection could hardly have been predicted with any certainty on the basis of Paul's prior dealings with Jerusalem. When Paul first visited there, Peter, then leader of that community, not only received him (Gal 1,18-19) but also, or so L. contends, approved his mission to the Gentiles. (L. not very convincingly argues that Gal 2,7 is a Pauline memorandum recording this approval.) Following L.'s chronology, Paul then began his mission to Asia Minor and Greece. However, a quite conservative group at Jerusalem, the "false brethren" who later demanded Titus' circumcision (Gal 2,3-5), gained sufficient power after Paul's first visit to install their own man, James, as leader in place of Peter. 1 Cor 15,5 and 7 contain echoes of this contest for the "Primacy". L., who, as has been seen, places the Antioch confrontation (Gal 2,11-14) prior to the Jerusalem conference, supposes that James was so strong that fear of him and his party was sufficient to cause Peter to relent from his legal "deviationism" at Antioch. Such an interpretation of Gal 2,12 uncritically accepts Paul's version of this event at face value. We lack Peter's own explanation; he might, for example, have advanced the avoidance of scandal as a defense—see 1 Cor 8-10, Rom 14,1-15,13 for such arguments. Yet if this view of the power of James and his party is correct, why then did the Apostolic conference not only approve Paul's Gentile mission as such but also a Law-free Gentile mission (Gal 2,6 [*ouden prosanethento*], 2,10)? It is true, as L. notes, that this conference

apparently did not give explicit acceptance to Paul's claim to be an "apostle". Paul himself in Gal 2,8 avoids a direct claim to the *apostolē* enjoyed by Peter. However, the conference did accept Paul's mission, and L.'s cynical supposition that in this matter the Jerusalem opposition had been bought off by the number of new converts and the promise of money is without textual support. Despite his difficulties with the Jerusalem authorities at the time of the writing of Gal, it is Paul who insists (Gal 2,7.9) that they accepted his ministry because they had discerned it as God's will.

L. further attempts to demonstrate the power and the monolithic character of the Pauline opposition at Jerusalem by supposing that in the immediate aftermath of the conference it was linked with *all* of the various opponents referred to by Paul in Gal, 1 Cor, 2 Cor, Phil, and Rom 3,8. In the case of the Galatian opponents such a link is possible although the festal observances of Gal 4,10 pose something of a problem for any "Judaizer" theory. That this same type of opposition is to be found at Corinth, however, is very doubtful. There are, as L. notes, places in 1 Cor (e.g., 9,1-6 and 15,8-11) where Paul defends his apostolic claims in a manner that recalls Gal, but these texts hardly serve to define the nature of the *Corinthian* opposition as this is delineated especially in 1 Cor 1-4. And the opponents of 2 Cor do not even meet L.'s own minimal requirement for being included among Jewish Christians for they are never associated by Paul with any demands for observance of the ritual Law. In the case of Phil Paul's claim to be "an Israelite of the tribe of Benjamin" and a "Pharisee" (3,5) in no way demonstrates that those who were urging circumcision had direct ties with Jerusalem. Rom 3,8, finally, is so general that it cannot be used, as L. would have it, to assert the presence at Rome of Jewish Christians with close ties with the Jerusalem traditionalists. L.'s case that the opposition to Paul was systematically linked with Jerusalem will not stand.

I suspect that L.'s analysis runs into problems because of his tendency to read the data through a lense of Reformation polemics. Thus, the Jerusalem church is the locus of the "Primacy" whether this be held by Peter or by James. It is ever intent on legal and organizational matters. Paul on the other hand stands for freedom, for the Gospel, for Christ. As L. puts this: "Eine antipaulinische Einstellung... was, theologisch gesehen, der Widerspruch eines nomistisch orientierten Christentums gegenüber der christologisch fundierten Religion des Paulus" (165). The image of a robust and manipulative Jerusalem church, its fingers into everything, is simply too one-sided to do justice to the case. The Jerusalem community was clearly the locus of a clash of critical values, and Paul's claims, however clear to us today, could easily have been looked upon as a betrayal of all of God's revelation to Israel. L. would have done well to head Paul's own sensitivity to these concerns as set forth especially in his great *apologia* to the Roman church. L. admits that in the end Baur's work suffered from a certain angularity and one-sidedness. I believe that his own study has not escaped this defect.

Theology Department
Marquette University
Milwaukee, WI 53233 USA

Robert A. WILD, S.J.

NUNTII PERSONARUM ET RERUM

1909 — 7 Maggio — 1984

75° Anniversario della fondazione del Pontificio Istituto Biblico

In occasione del 75° anniversario dell'Istituto Biblico, il Santo Padre Giovanni Paolo II ha ricevuto, il 17 maggio 1984, i professori, studenti e collaboratori dell'Istituto e ha loro indirizzato il seguente discorso.

Ho accolto molto volentieri la richiesta di questa Udienza particolare con voi, in occasione del 75° anniversario della fondazione dell'Istituto Biblico, voluto dal mio Santo Predecessore, Pio X, al fine di promuovere il progresso degli studi biblici e curarne la immunità da errori.

Saluto con sincero affetto il Cardinale Baum, a cui va anche il mio ringraziamento per le nobili parole, con le quali ha voluto così gentilmente introdurre questo familiare incontro. Saluto parimente il Preposito Generale della Compagnia di Gesù, Padre Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, il Rettore Magnifico e tutto il Corpo docente, che tiene alto il prestigio dell'Istituto; e voi, specialmente, carissimi giovani studenti provenienti da ogni parte del mondo e desiderosi di acquistare una profonda conoscenza della Parola di Dio. Siate tutti benvenuti: «Grazia a voi e pace da parte di Dio, Padre nostro, e dal Signore Gesù Cristo» (Gal 1,3).

Dalla sua creazione fino ai nostri giorni, il «Biblico» rimane uno dei luoghi privilegiati, dove gli studiosi dedicano il meglio di sé all'approfondimento della Sacra Scrittura, e di quelle scienze che permettono di comprenderla meglio. Per questo servizio che rendete alla Chiesa con totale fedeltà ai desideri del vostro Fondatore, vi esprimo la mia gioia e gratitudine. E aggiungo un ringraziamento speciale alla Compagnia di Gesù che continua a spendersi generosamente affinché questo servizio ecclesiale, reso sia dalla Facoltà dell'Oriente Antico, sia dalla Facoltà Biblica a Roma e dalla sede dell'Istituto a Gerusalemme, sia sempre più rispondente alle esigenze dei tempi.

Voi venite a Roma da tutti i paesi del mondo per studiare, insegnare o collaborare a far meglio conoscere la Sacra Scrittura. Il vostro lavoro è destinato a produrre, e produce di fatto, abbondanti frutti. I vostri lavori hanno una grande risonanza e la vostra responsabilità si estende a tutta la Chiesa. Siatene consapevoli!

Certo, il vostro studio comporta un impegno serio ed austero. La conoscenza delle lingue sacre e dell'ambiente, nel quale la Bibbia è nata, richiede sforzi perseveranti, disponibilità a capire un mondo, tanto diverso dal nostro, in cui la Parola di Dio ha preso una forma letteraria. Questo studio è perciò

un servizio specifico reso alla Chiesa, un ministero, un apostolato. Esso richiede, come direbbe S. Ignazio di Loyola, lo sforzo dell'uomo intero (*Constitutiones S.J.*, IV, 4, 2, n. 340): della memoria, della sensibilità, della intelligenza e volontà. Non potete rispondere pienamente alla vostra responsabilità ecclesiale senza impegnarvi totalmente. Perciò la buona volontà, la fede, la preghiera e l'amore a Dio e alla Sua Chiesa non possono essere assenti dal vostro impegno per la Parola ispirata. Come d'altronde uno studioso può avvicinare i Libri Sacri senza lo sforzo di ascoltare sinceramente e di mettere lui stesso in pratica ciò che legge e cerca di capire?

Il profondo rispetto che nutrite per la Sacra Scrittura vi porta a toccare più da vicino le testimonianze uniche su Colui che sta al centro della nostra fede, Gesù Cristo, nostro Salvatore, annunciato dai Profeti, proclamato dagli Apostoli. I testi sacri sono il luogo privilegiato, dove si manifesta la misteriosa realtà della salvezza, che Dio ci offre in Gesù Cristo. Non cessate di scrutare questi testi con le vostre ricerche filologiche, linguistiche, letterarie, storiche: esse, anche se ardue e faticose, sono quanto mai utili per meglio comprendere la Parola di Dio. La fedeltà al testo sacro, a noi trasmesso, rimane e deve rimanere una delle vostre caratteristiche. È vero, nella ricerca del senso dei testi, come in quella dell'ambiente storico dove sono nati, rimangono ancora le oscurità che i lavori scientifici vanno chiarendo a poco a poco. Si propongono ipotesi sempre più affinate per riflettere ancor più fedelmente i dati offerti dal testo stesso. In tutte queste ricerche, necessarie oggi, la prudenza, la discrezione e la sobrietà sono sempre richieste da colui che analizza i testi. E questo tanto più in quanto gli scritti biblici, che esprimono la fede della Chiesa, sono la regola della sua fede. Animati da queste virtù, e sulla scia dei vostri predecessori, tra i quali mi piace ricordare il Cardinale Bea, continuate a dare il vostro contributo per una «più profonda intelligenza ed esposizione del senso della Sacra Scrittura, fornendo i dati previsti, dai quali si maturi il giudizio della Chiesa» (cf. *Dei Verbum*, n. 12).

Opera scientifica e opera di fede, il vostro impegno infatti è essenzialmente un servizio ecclesiale. La Chiesa sente ogni giorno più chiaramente la necessità di attingere alla Sacra Scrittura per leggersi ciò che essa è, e ciò che è chiamata ad essere. Non c'è vita spirituale, catechesi o pastorale che non esigano questo ritorno costante ai Libri Sacri. Anche le altre scienze sacre, ugualmente fondamentali per la vita della Chiesa, richiedono da voi oggi una collaborazione, alla quale non potete sottrarvi. Esse, soprattutto la teologia dogmatica e la teologia morale, risentono l'urgenza di approfondire metodologicamente i loro fondamenti biblici. Il Concilio Vaticano II, riprendendo l'affermazione dei Padri, afferma che la Scrittura è come l'anima della teologia (cf. *Dei Verbum*, n. 24). La vostra missione ecclesiale non si deve perciò fermare alla spiegazione del testo sacro, ma deve contribuire alla chiarificazione delle questioni dogmatiche e morali, — per prendere soltanto questi due campi più urgenti —, affinché sia messa sempre più in evidenza l'unità della fede e della morale cristiana. Aggiungo anche che nel dialogo con i nostri fratelli separati, come pure in quello con i figli di Abramo secondo la carne, la vostra presenza attiva è molto spesso di primaria importanza per ritrovare ciò che ci unisce nell'unico Signore Dio e Padre. Infine, poiché oggi tante culture si affiancano all'Istituto Biblico, prendete sempre più coscienza,

nel vostro impegno esegetico, delle esigenze di una nuova sfida lanciata alla Chiesa del nostro tempo: aiutatela a mettere a disposizione di tutte le culture il tesoro della Scrittura che la Chiesa affida alla vostra laboriosa dedizione.

Cari Fratelli, da 75 anni l'Istituto Biblico è al servizio della Chiesa e della Sede Apostolica, nello spirito del mandato ad esso affidato da San Pio X e dai suoi Successori. Nel rinnovarvi oggi tale consegna, vi esorto a far risplendere con fedeltà sempre nuova la conoscenza e l'amore dei Libri Sacri nella Chiesa e nell'universo intero, in serena adesione al Magistero vivo della Chiesa, cui è affidato l'ufficio di interpretare autenticamente la Parola di Dio scritta o trasmessa e la cui autorità è esercitata nel nome di Gesù Cristo (cf. *Dei Verbum*, n. 10). Come segno di incoraggiamento alla vostra specifica vocazione, vi imparto di gran cuore la mia speciale Benedizione.

Il 7 maggio 1984, dopo una celebrazione eucaristica nella chiesa dei SS. Apostoli, fu tenuta nell'Aula Magna dell'Istituto Biblico una commemorazione accademica, durante la quale furono pronunciati i discorsi seguenti.

Discorso di S. Em. Cardinale William Wakefield Baum, Gran Cancelliere

Lasciatemi esprimervi prima di tutto la mia gioia e la mia gratitudine di essere con voi in questo giorno nel quale festeggiamo tre quarti di secolo d'esistenza del Pontificio Istituto Biblico. Realizzando il desiderio di Leone XIII, San Pio X intendeva creare nel centro della cattolicità un luogo di studi biblici di alto livello scientifico e totalmente aderente alla fede cattolica. Con i corsi che si danno, con le sue ricerche, le sue pubblicazioni, la sua biblioteca, l'Istituto Biblico ha risposto e risponde tuttora alle speranze del suo Fondatore e ha ben meritato dalla Chiesa, come ben diceva nel dicembre 1979 il Papa Giovanni Paolo II. La Santa Sede ringrazia ciascuno per l'opera che vi si compie e aggiunge un grazie speciale alla Compagnia di Gesù che svolge con efficienza e coraggio il compito del Pontificio Istituto ad essa affidato fin dalla sua creazione.

Vorrei ripetervi oggi ciò che il Concilio Vaticano II scriveva, sulle orme del Papa Pio XII, nella Costituzione *Dei Verbum*: «Il Sacro Concilio incoraggia i figli della Chiesa che coltivano le scienze bibliche, affinché perseverino nel compimento dell'opera felicemente intrapresa, con energie sempre rinnovate, con ogni applicazione secondo il senso della Chiesa» (n. 23). Accogliete questo incoraggiamento, continuate a seguire le orme dei vostri predecessori, tra i quali risplende di una luce particolare il Card. Bea.

La stessa Costituzione conciliare formula anche i principi dell'interpretazione della Scrittura, e so che i vostri Statuti si riferiscono esplicitamente a questi testi che orientano il vostro lavoro a tutti, professori e studenti. «Poiché Dio nella Sacra Scrittura ha parlato per mezzo di uomini alla maniera umana, l'interprete della Sacra Scrittura, per vedere bene ciò che egli ha voluto comunicarci, deve ricercare con attenzione, che cosa gli agiografi in realtà hanno inteso significare e che cosa a Dio è piaciuto manifestare con le loro parole» (n. 12). Perciò, a causa del vostro rispetto per la Parola di Dio, affrontate lo studio austero delle lingue sacre e di quelle del Prossimo-Oriente

antico; le opere di alcuni dei vostri grandi maestri d'altronde vi tracciano la via: penso ai Padri Zorell, Joüon, Deimel, Zerwick, Dahood. Voi vi impegnate nell'esegesi storico-critica più acuta, degna di rispetto universale, nella quale maestri come i Padri Prümmer, Vogt o McCarthy vi indicano il cammino. In tutti questi settori, dialogate con gli esegeti di ogni paese, le opere dei quali formano la ricchezza della vostra biblioteca, confrontate i loro pareri, alla ricerca del senso del testo: la stupenda bibliografia biblica che il Padre Nöber ha redatto da solo durante tanti anni e che non avete abbandonato, serve di guida a voi, come a tutti gli esegeti del mondo.

E tuttavia, sempre con la Costituzione *Dei Verbum*, i vostri Statuti vi dicono che la Chiesa aspetta da voi ancora di più. «Dovendo la Sacra Scrittura, dice la Costituzione, essere letta e interpretata con l'aiuto dello stesso Spirito, mediante il quale è stata scritta, per ricavare con esattezza il senso dei sacri testi, si deve badare con non minore diligenza al contenuto e alla unità di tutta la Scrittura, tenuto debito conto della viva tradizione di tutta la Chiesa e dell'analogia della fede» (n. 12). So che siete sempre più sensibili a queste esigenze di una esegesi autenticamente cattolica; mi congratulo con voi e non posso non incoraggiarvi a continuare con questo spirito.

E allora, come dice ancora la *Dei Verbum*, renderete, con tutto questo insieme di approccio e di ricerca, il vostro servizio specifico alla Chiesa, che è quello di far maturare il suo giudizio (cfr. n. 12). Poiché è alla Chiesa che sottomettete la vostra esegesi, ad essa alla quale la Parola di Dio fu affidata. E ciascuno sa quanto la Chiesa del nostro tempo ha ricevuto dai suoi esegeti, la maggioranza dei quali si sono formati tra queste mura.

Cari professori e cari studenti, futuri professori dappertutto nel mondo, dalla Chiesa ricevete la missione che vi porta all'Istituto Biblico e per la Chiesa iniziate e proseguite il vostro studio della Sacra Scrittura. Avete nella Chiesa un ruolo specifico e la Chiesa conta e deve contare su di voi. Infatti, come dice di nuovo la Costituzione *Dei Verbum*: «La Chiesa, nella sua dottrina, nella sua vita e nel suo culto, perpetua e trasmette a tutte le generazioni tutto ciò che essa è, tutto ciò che essa crede... La comprensione, tanto delle realtà quanto delle parole trasmesse, cresce sia con la riflessione e lo studio dei credenti, i quali le meditano in cuor loro, sia con la profonda intelligenza che essi provano delle cose spirituali, sia con la predicazione di coloro i quali con la successione episcopale hanno ricevuto il carisma certo di verità» (n. 8). Il vostro servizio ecclesiale si situa a livello particolare dello studio; però, lo sapete, questo non va separato dalla contemplazione e dall'intelligenza interiore, — «gustare res interne», direbbe Sant'Ignazio di Loyola, — delle realtà che la vostra missione nella Chiesa vi fanno avvicinare. Come diceva anche San Bonaventura (cfr. Vaticano II, *Optatam Totius*, nota 32), «che nessuno creda che gli basta la lettura senza l'unzione, la speculazione senza la devozione, la ricerca senza l'ammirazione, ... la scienza senza la carità, l'intelligenza senza l'umiltà, ... la spiegazione senza la sapienza ispirata da Dio». Ricordate quanto il Papa Paolo VI, che ha tanto stimato i vostri lavori, ha insistito su questi atteggiamenti interiori e spirituali della vostra missione di esegeti.

Cari amici, ricordando tutto ciò, desidero solo dirvi ciò che siete, dirvi anche la fiducia e la speranza che la Chiesa e in particolare la Sede Aposto-

lica ripongono in voi. Che il Signore vi conceda di proseguire il vostro servizio nella fedeltà e nella serenità.

Discorso del M.R.P. Peter-Hans Kolvenbach, S. J., Vice-Gran Cancelliere

Lo stesso giorno in cui fu pubblicata nell'*Osservatore Romano* la Lettera Apostolica «Vinea electa» del Papa San Pio X, il Cardinale Merry del Val, Segretario di Stato, scriveva al Generale dei Gesuiti, Padre Wernz, che il Papa affidava l'Istituto Biblico alla Compagnia di Gesù.

La missione che la Compagnia ha ricevuto 75 anni fa, abbiamo cercato di realizzarla nel modo migliore e siamo disposti a continuarla, mettendo a servizio della Santa Sede e della Chiesa universale tutte le nostre forze disponibili.

Certo, nel campo biblico, ieri come oggi, le difficoltà non mancano. Però, anche se all'inizio di questo secolo l'esegesi biblica provocava nella Chiesa gravi tensioni, queste si sono placate e la concordia nella collaborazione si è felicemente instaurata. L'enciclica «Divino afflante Spiritu» di Pio XII e la costituzione «Dei Verbum» del Vaticano II hanno chiaramente tracciato la via, che la Compagnia, mandando uomini ad insegnare al Biblico, intende seguire.

Lo fa con gratitudine per la fiducia che la Santa Sede le manifesta in questo servizio, ma anche con profonda gioia, perché questa missione risponde ad una sua aspirazione di sempre: quella di servire la Parola di Dio. Fin dalle origini, la Compagnia di Gesù ha sentito la chiamata di Dio ad aiutare tutti i cristiani, anzi tutti gli uomini, all'ascolto della Parola di Dio, a gustarla interiormente, a nutrirsene, a viverne. Di fatto, il servizio della parola di Dio — *Verbum Dei ministerium* — occupa un posto di primo piano nella *Formula Instituti* che definisce la vocazione del gesuita.

Il fatto che la Compagnia di Gesù sia nata in un'epoca segnata da un potente rinnovamento degli studi umanistici e insieme da appassionate controversie sul senso delle Scritture, l'ha resa consapevole, fin dall'inizio, dell'importanza della scienza biblica per l'approfondimento e la difesa della fede. Nel 1537, prima della fondazione della Compagnia, Pierre Favre insegnava la Scrittura nell'Università della Sapienza a Roma. I primi gesuiti davano lezioni sulla Scrittura nelle chiese in Italia e in Germania: il che supposeva un attento studio del testo sacro. Un altro tra i primi compagni di Sant'Ignazio, Alonso Salmerón, compose 16 volumi di commento al Nuovo Testamento. Rilevo inoltre che nelle Costituzioni della Compagnia di Gesù Ignazio stabiliva che lo studio della Sacra Scrittura non doveva precedere quello della teologia scolastica.

L'impulso avvertito alle origini ha prodotto in seguito dei risultati considerevoli a tal punto che si è potuto parlare di una età dell'oro dell'esegesi cattolica nel secolo che seguì al Concilio di Trento. Evidentemente i gesuiti non furono gli unici a contribuirvi, ma i loro lavori esegetici hanno fortemente marcato quest'epoca. Si sa quanto influsso Juan Maldonado e Cornelio a Lapide esercitarono sullo sviluppo della scienza biblica nei secoli seguenti.

Col rinnovamento degli studi biblici alla fine del XIX secolo era quindi naturale che dei gesuiti vi si fossero coraggiosamente già impegnati. Poco dopo i Domenicani di Mossul, i Gesuiti di Beyrouth tradussero la Bibbia in arabo classico. In Occidente il P. Rudolf Cornely iniziava con l'aiuto di confratelli la pubblicazione del celebre *Cursus Scripturae Sacrae*. Quando il Papa Pio X fondò l'Istituto Biblico, il Padre Cornely era morto da poco, ma altri gesuiti erano in piena attività negli studi biblici e orientali: cosa che consentì al Padre Wernz di costituire un valido corpo docente per il nuovo Istituto, di cui fece presto parte il P. Alberto Vaccari, che ancora molti di voi hanno conosciuto.

Durante i tre quarti di secolo trascorsi dalla fondazione del Biblico la Compagnia si è sforzata di adempiere il meglio possibile la missione che le era stata affidata, avendone compreso sempre più l'importanza per la fede e la vita della Chiesa. In realtà si tratta di una responsabilità così grande, che qualsiasi sforzo è insufficiente per rispondervi perfettamente.

La situazione attuale richiede un lavoro ancora più intenso. Infatti il Concilio Vaticano II ha dato un forte impulso scientifico e orientamenti pastorali fecondi nel campo degli studi biblici: la fedeltà al testo biblico oggi esige un commento che osa andare al di là del testo, ispirando per tramite dell'interdisciplinarietà tutte le scienze teologiche; il dialogo con il Popolo del Libro e il dialogo ecumenico suppongono una ricerca biblica rinnovata; lo sviluppo della Chiesa in Africa e in Asia pone i biblisti davanti a nuove esigenze pastorali per il confronto con altre culture; progressi recenti nelle scienze del linguaggio, particolarmente nella semiologia linguistica e nell'analisi dei discorsi, aprono nuovi compiti. Oggi dunque, la missione ricevuta nel 1909 acquista rinnovata attualità.

In questa festosa ricorrenza, mi congratulo con voi tutti, Rettore, Decani, Professori, Studenti e Collaboratori, per la qualità del vostro impegno al servizio ecclesiale della Parola di Dio. Ringrazio il Signore per l'occasione data alla Compagnia di servire la Chiesa e il Vicario di Cristo in questo ministero così fondamentale. Ringrazio Sua Eminenza per averci onorato con la Sua presenza, e La prego rispettosamente di assicurare il Santo Padre della totale disponibilità della Compagnia a continuare ad adempiere con lealtà il compito ricevuto 75 anni fa *Ad Maiorem Dei Gloriam*.

Discorso del R. P. Maurice Gilbert, S. J., Rettore

In questo 75° anno della fondazione del Pontificio Istituto Biblico, il nostro primo gesto è stato durante la celebrazione eucaristica e rimane, all'inizio di questa commemorazione accademica, azione di grazie al Dio tre volte Santo, al Padre delle misericordie, al Verbo che ha assunto la nostra carne e allo Spirito che ha parlato per mezzo dei profeti, per il dono che ci è stato fatto di consacrare il nostro spirito e il nostro cuore allo studio della Parola ispirata. Azione di grazie per la fiducia che la Chiesa di Cristo ci ha manifestato continuamente, e specialmente durante i 25 ultimi anni, segnati dalla preparazione, la celebrazione e l'applicazione del Concilio Vaticano II.

Azione di grazie per la sollecitudine del tutto particolare con la quale i Sommi Pontefici Giovanni XXIII, Paolo VI, Giovanni Paolo I e l'attuale Pontefice Giovanni Paolo II hanno seguito l'Istituto, il loro Istituto. Eminenza, nella Sua qualità di Gran Cancelliere, Lei rappresenta direttamente in mezzo a noi il Santo Padre; la Sua presenza ci onora e La ringraziamo con rispetto. Azione di grazie per la fedeltà con la quale la Compagnia di Gesù ha accettato l'incarico di questa Istituzione ecclesiale, assicurando continuamente il suo sviluppo e la promozione dell'opera che vi si compie. Reverendissimo Padre, in quanto Vice-Gran Cancelliere, Lei sta tra di noi come il testimone di questa provvidenza e Gliene siamo grati. Azione di grazie per la fiducia che tanti Vescovi e Superiori religiosi hanno manifestato verso l'Istituto mandandovi con generosità e spesso con grandi sacrifici, un grandissimo numero di studenti, nei quali hanno riposto tanta speranza. Azione di grazie infine per tanti begli esempi di fedeltà e di serietà nell'impegno austero che tutti abbiamo ricevuto da professori, da studenti e studentesse e dai nostri collaboratori.

Quando l'Istituto ha celebrato il suo 25° e il 50° anniversario venne ricordato l'essenziale della sua storia. A noi oggi il compito di ricordarci, con spirito di ringraziamento ciò che ha maggiormente inciso negli ultimi 25 anni. Certo, come tutta la vita della Chiesa, lo spirito e l'attività di questa Istituzione sono stati profondamente segnati dal Concilio Vaticano II. Vorrei ricordare soltanto alcuni grandi orientamenti dell'Istituto durante questo ultimo quarto di secolo.

Il Concilio fu probabilmente la prima grande esperienza dell'universalità della Chiesa. E di fatto attorno all'epoca del Concilio e soprattutto dopo, si può osservare una considerevole crescita nel numero degli studenti e studentesse, fino alle dimensioni di tutta la cattolicità. Mentre, fino alla vigilia del Concilio, la grande maggioranza degli studenti erano chierici e provenivano dai Paesi occidentali, si è visto arrivare a poco a poco all'Istituto, non soltanto dei fratelli, delle suore, dei laici, uomini e donne, ma soprattutto gli studenti e studentesse provengono ormai dai 5 continenti della terra. Mentre nel 1959 l'Istituto accoglieva 200 studenti, ne contava 380 nel 1969, e attualmente 287 per il ciclo che porta alla licenza e 70 per il dottorato. Inoltre, da qualche anno, più della metà degli studenti appartengono a Paesi non occidentali, dall'Africa, dall'Asia, dall'America Latina. Così l'Istituto può manifestare più visibilmente oggi la sua vocazione di servizio universale. E nell'avvenire importerà che questa universalità sia anche manifestata nel corpo accademico.

Sotto l'influsso del Concilio anche, i nostri Statuti furono adattati prima del 1972 e poi recentemente secondo lo spirito della Costituzione «Sapientia Christiana» dell'attuale Pontefice. Da già più di 20 anni, il realismo ha portato l'Istituto ad offrire un corso propedeutico di greco e di ebraico, assicurando così ai futuri biblisti la base linguistica fondamentale. Durante il ciclo della licenza in Facoltà Biblica, una maggiore libertà di scelta tra i corsi esegetici è lasciata da più di 10 anni agli studenti, e ciò ha richiesto ai professori una più grande disponibilità. Il dialogo franco e costruttivo che gli stessi Statuti hanno instaurato tra professori e studenti nei vari Consigli, ha prodotto senza alcun dubbio, fin dal maggio 1968, dei frutti notevoli. Una migliore

preparazione al servizio comune della Parola di Dio nella Chiesa esige infatti questa collaborazione tra tutti.

Quanto ai programmi della Facoltà Biblica, è ancora dal Concilio Vaticano II che derivano tre grandi orientamenti della nostra epoca. Prima di tutto, una più grande attenzione al messaggio stesso della Scrittura, alla teologia che trasmette, e ciò senza perdere niente, al contrario, delle esigenze di una sana critica biblica, a livello filologico, storico o culturale. Poiché, se per la Chiesa, la Scrittura è la «norma normans», coloro che ricevono la missione ecclesiale di studiarla, devono farlo in vista della sua autentica proclamazione: la buona novella della nostra salvezza deve essere trasmessa a tutti e tutti ne hanno diritto. Questo orientamento più teologico della nostra esegesi risponde tra l'altro ad un desiderio sempre più chiaro dei nostri studenti e se ne vede uno dei primi frutti nella nostra collana «*Analecta Biblica*»; creata nel 1952, questa ha conosciuto non soltanto un ritmo sempre accelerato fino ad oltrepassare oggi i 100 volumi, ma il numero di quelli che offrono un contributo di valore teologico va anch'esso crescendo.

D'altra parte, l'esegesi biblica non si può fare senza una conoscenza del mondo nel quale è nata la Sacra Scrittura, né senza una conoscenza del mondo che l'ha trasmessa e letta prima di noi. Creata un po' più di 50 anni fa, nel 1932, la Facoltà per lo studio dell'Oriente Antico continua a rendere servizi importanti alla Facoltà Biblica, sia con l'insegnamento delle lingue del Prossimo-Oriente antico, sia offrendo in questi ultimi anni dei corsi sulla letteratura e la religione di questi popoli. Egualmente per il mondo giudaico antico; già nel lontano 1934, 50 anni fa, i primi corsi in questo campo furono offerti all'Istituto, ma soprattutto fin da più o meno 20 anni un importante investimento si è potuto realizzare. I Targumim, i Midrashim e il Talmud sono insegnati, come la letteratura giudaica intertestamentaria; per collaborare a questo impegno, la Biblioteca si è arricchita di una bella collezione di opere fondamentali in questo campo; inoltre, alla nostra casa di Gerusalemme, inaugurata nel 1927, quasi 60 anni fa, i nostri studenti hanno la possibilità ogni anno di seguire un corso di 7 mesi all'Università Ebraica; questo programma, creato nel 1975, sotto il rettorato dell'attuale Card. Martini, offre dunque a molti studenti, non soltanto l'occasione di vivere qualche tempo in Terra Santa, ma anche di entrare in contatto personale con il giudaismo così come lo stesso comprende oggi la propria tradizione. Questa collaborazione si ispira di nuovo al Concilio Vaticano II, dove il Card. Bea, a suo tempo rettore del Biblico, fu una figura di primo piano. Un'apertura ecumenica si è anch'essa manifestata nell'Istituto e ringraziamo gli esegeti non cattolici che collaborano al nostro insegnamento e alle nostre pubblicazioni.

Ma la tradizione esegetica comporta soprattutto il periodo patristico, il Medioevo e il Rinascimento; senza dubbio, l'esegesi attuale si è molto arricchita con la scienza di quest'ultimo secolo, ma se essa deve rimanere un'esegesi cristiana non può dimenticare i suoi predecessori, i pionieri delle origini. Fin dalla creazione dell'Istituto, più precisamente dal 1911, il P. Alberto Vaccari aveva offerto un insegnamento sull'esegesi patristica, e fino al 1934. Soltanto questi ultimi anni un corso in questa materia è stato di nuovo offerto, ma questa volta obbligatoriamente. In questo campo ancora, la Biblioteca offre il suo contributo tanto apprezzato, e ci auguriamo che questo ritorno

alle fonti dell'esegesi stessa arricchisca in maniera notevole la sua portata teologica.

Vorrei ancora menzionare, sempre in segno di ringraziamento, lo sforzo enorme, iniziato sotto il rettorato del P. Martini, oggi Cardinale Arcivescovo di Milano, per rinnovare l'edificio dell'Istituto e la sua sede di Gerusalemme. Senza l'aiuto della Santa Sede e della Compagnia di Gesù, questi lavori non avrebbero potuto essere realizzati, a gran danno delle nostre attività accademiche. Il nome di «Aula Paolina» è la testimonianza indelebile della nostra gratitudine verso il Papa Paolo VI, e l'ampliamento della Biblioteca, divenuto necessario, permette d'ora in poi, di guardare l'avvenire con serenità.

Questo breve quadro delle nostre attività durante i 25 ultimi anni prova, lo spero, che l'Istituto Biblico, malgrado le difficoltà incontrate, che in certi periodi furono gravissime, continua e vuol continuare il suo servizio con grande vitalità. Tutti ne partecipano, professori, studenti (più di 5.000 sono passati qui in 75 anni), e i nostri collaboratori. Che il Signore ci dia la grazia di proseguire l'opera che Egli ci ha affidata nella Sua Chiesa.

Ernst Vogt, S. J. (1903-1984):

In Memoriam

Originaire de Bâle, — il naquit le 30 janvier 1903 d'une famille qui allait donner le grand archéologue Emil Vogt, son frère, — Ernst Vogt avait le sens et le goût proverbial des Suisses pour le travail précis et bien fait. Entré dans la Compagnie de Jésus en 1921, il fut ordonné prêtre en 1933 à Innsbruck, en Autriche. Un an plus tard, il commença ses études d'exégèse à l'Institut Biblique Pontifical où il obtint, avec le plus haut grade, le doctorat en science biblique avec une étude sur *Der Erwählungsglaube im Alten Testament*, qu'il défendit le 22 juin 1939, en présence du Cardinal Jos. Pizzardo, Grand Chancelier de l'Institut; mais seuls les extraits les plus importants furent publiés en tirage limité hors-commerce. Il rejoignit ensuite São Leopoldo, au sud du Brésil, où il avait déjà passé quatre années, de 1926 à 1930, et il enseigna l'Écriture au théologat des Jésuites jusqu'en 1948. Durant ces premières années de professorat, il publia déjà une vingtaine d'articles, tous en portugais, principalement sur le nom de Marie à la lumière des découvertes archéologiques récentes (il a laissé, à sa mort, l'ébauche d'une mise à jour de cette étude), sur l'Apocalypse de s. Jean et principalement sur les Psaumes, dont il donna une traduction portugaise avec introductions et notes: *Os Salmos* (S. Paulo 1951) 375 p. En 1947, il devint, par acclamation unanime, le premier président de la *Liga de Estudos Bíblicos* du Brésil, à laquelle il demeura toujours attaché. Cependant en 1949, il fut rappelé à Rome pour enseigner l'exégèse de l'Ancien Testament et surtout pour prendre la succession du P. Augustin Bea comme recteur de l'Institut Biblique Pontifical; il le resta jusqu'en 1963. Sa nouvelle charge ne l'empêcha pas de poursuivre son enseignement et ses publications; de 1953 à 1962, il assumait aussi la direction de la revue *Biblica*, où il offrait régulièrement, outre quelques articles substantiels, de brèves notices rassemblées sous le titre de *Nuntii personarum et rerum*. Son enseignement porta sur la critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament, hébreu et grec (1949 et 1950), sur la formation du psautier et sur les genres littéraires des Psaumes (le livre bien connu de P. Drijvers, *Over de Psalmen* [Utrecht 1956], traduit sous le titre *Les Psaumes. Genres littéraires et thèmes doctrinaux* [Paris 1958], lui doit beaucoup, ainsi que le reconnaît l'auteur); mais l'intérêt du P. Vogt le portait vers les grands prophètes, Isaïe, Jérémie et Ezéchiel, qu'il étudia et enseigna dès son arrivée à l'Institut et jusqu'en 1975, date de son passage à l'éméritat.

Vers la fin de son rectorat, il eut à faire face aux difficultés que l'Institut rencontra à la veille et au début du concile Vatican II, et il le fit avec droiture et respect. Professeur, il préparait ses cours toujours à nouveaux frais, écrivant tout jusqu'au détail, et souvent en sténographie; son exégèse, essen-

tiellement historico-critique, était toute de rigueur; on peut même le considérer comme le premier exégète de très grande classe qu'ait connu l'Institut. Déchargé du rectorat, il entreprit la préparation et l'édition de son œuvre fondamentale, le *Lexicon linguae aramaicae Veteris Testamenti documentis antiquis illustratum* (Roma 1971) 13*-192 p. Lorsqu'en 1975, il renonça à l'enseignement, il poursuivit ses recherches; il envisageait de rassembler ses meilleurs articles en un volume, mais très vite il se rendit compte qu'il pouvait reprendre l'ensemble de ses observations sur le livre d'Ezéchiel en un volume entièrement neuf, ou presque: *Untersuchungen zum Buch Ezechiel* (Analecta Biblica 95; Rome 1981) x-180 p., qui fut bien accueilli. Il poursuivit son travail jusqu'en juin 1983, s'attachant alors aux événements que Jérusalem avait vécus en 701 av. J.-C.; il a laissé sur ce sujet un manuscrit presque terminé.

Les derniers mois, il déclina lentement. Avec une patience qui faisait l'admiration et une sérénité de plus en plus évidente, il se prépara au grand départ. Le Seigneur lui accorda d'être lucide jusqu'au bout; les derniers jours, il multiplia ses remerciements et s'endormit dans la paix de Dieu le matin du 28 février 1984. R.I.P.

Maurice GILBERT, S. J.,
Recteur

Viliam Pavlovský (1911-1984):

In Memoriam

Né le 17 décembre 1911 à Pečenady, en Slovaquie, Viliam Pavlovský entra dans le Compagnie de Jésus en 1930; il étudia la philosophie à Cracovie, puis la théologie à Chieri, près de Turin, où il fut ordonné prêtre le 30 mai 1940. Un an plus tard, de retour dans son pays, il commença son enseignement de l'Écriture Sainte à l'Institut S. Louis des jésuites à Banska Bystrica et le poursuivit jusqu'en 1946. Il fut alors envoyé à l'Institut Biblique Pontifical pour y prendre les grades en science biblique. Il défendit sa thèse doctorale le 8 avril 1954; elle avait pour titre: «La riforma religiosa di Esdra. Saggio di una nuova ricostruzione»; il en publia les meilleures pages dans *Biblica* 38 (1957) 275-305, 428-456, sous le titre: «Die Chronologie der Tätigkeit Esdras». On sait que le P. Pavlovský situait la venue d'Esdras à Jérusalem après celle de Néhémie, en 428, soit en la 37^e année d'Artaxerxès I^{er} (en modifiant donc le texte d'Esdras 7,7). Son intérêt pour l'histoire religieuse s'était déjà révélé par un article de synthèse: «De religione Cananaeorum tempore occupationis Israeliticae», *Verbum Domini* 27 (1949) 143-163, 193-205.

La thèse doctorale une fois soutenue, il demeura comme professeur à l'Institut Biblique, où il fit cours durant près de trente ans sans discontinuer. Il enseigna tout d'abord l'histoire d'Israël après l'exil, mais, dès 1958, il s'attacha à l'histoire de la période royale, et tout spécialement à la chronologie des rois de Juda et d'Israël; il établissait celle-ci sur la base de quelques principes: en Juda l'année commençait à l'automne, tandis qu'en Israël elle débutait au printemps; il faut compter avec la possibilité d'un co-règne; en Juda l'année d'accession au trône était comptée comme année 0; le P. Pavlovský aboutissait ainsi à une chronologie qui ne modifiait que très rarement les données textuelles de la Bible. Avec le P. Ernst Vogt, il en publia une synthèse intitulée: «Die Jahre der Könige von Juda und Israel», *Biblica* 45 (1964) 321-354. Son dernier cours sur le sujet, il le fit en janvier 1983.

Il assumait aussi, de 1963 à 1982, le cours d'histoire de la période néotestamentaire, où la date de la naissance de Jésus (en 7 avant notre ère) retenait toute son attention. Mais le P. Pavlovský était également très doué pour les langues anciennes et modernes (surtout les langues slaves). De 1954 à 1959, il fit un cours supérieur d'araméen; puis, de 1960 à 1982, un cours de syriaque; et même, de 1961 à 1968, un cours d'arabe. Il ajouta encore, de 1960 à 1965, un cours ou un séminaire d'exégèse sur les livres d'Esdras-Néhémie.

On le voit, ses charges d'enseignement furent lourdes durant les années

60. Sa santé s'en ressentit. Quelques années plus tard, il fut frappé par un infarctus; ses yeux peu à peu le firent souffrir; et pourtant il continuait à rendre son service académique. Homme au cœur simple, modeste et retiré, mais qui ne manquait pas d'humour, il laissa l'enseignement en janvier 1983. Sa dernière année, passée à l'infirmerie de l'Université Grégorienne, fut paisible, malgré un cœur épuisé; une dernière crise l'emporta en deux heures de temps dans la matinée du 13 mars 1984. R.I.P.

Maurice GILBERT, S. J.,
Recteur

Pontificium Institutum Biblicum
Annus academicus 1983-1984. II semestre

Auditores inscripti erant 300, qui in diversas categorias sic distribuebantur:

	Ad Doctoratum	Ad Licentiam	Hospites	Universi
Fac. Biblica	19	251	26	296
Fac. Orientalistica	—	1	3	4
Universi	19	252	29	300
Nationes	50	Alumni	300	
Dioceses	147	Alumni	150	
Inst. Religiosorum	47	Alumni	116	
Inst. Religiosarum	9	Alumnae	10	
Ex statu laicali	24	Alumnae	14	
		Alumni	10	

Laureae

Laurea in Re Biblica digni declarati sunt:

NARÉ, Laurent (13.XII.83). *La deuxième collection salomonienne (Prov. 25-29) et les proverbes Mossi* (Magna cum laude). Moderator: M. GILBERT.

MARTÍN JUÁREZ, Miguel Angel, O.S.A. (20.XII.83). *La historia de Israel vista por Ben Sira* (Magna cum laude). Moderator: M. GILBERT.

CARNITI, Cecilia, S.A. (14.I.84). *Studio letterario del Salmo 68* (Cum laude). Moderator: D. J. MACCARTHY † — M. GILBERT.

SKA, Jean-Louis, S. J. (21.III.84). *Le passage de la mer: étude de la construction, du style et de la symbolique d'Ex 13,17-14,31* (Summa cum laude). Moderator: D. J. MACCARTHY † — N. LOHFINK.

SPREAFICO, Ambrogio (13.IV.84). *Lo schema letterario dell'esodo nei profeti preesilici* (Cum laude). Moderator: L. ALONSO SCHÖKEL.

Doctores in Re Biblica renuntiati sunt, typis edita thesi:

ABREGO DE LACY, José Maria, *Jeremias y el final del reino. Lectura sincrónica de Jer 36-45* (Estudios del Antiguo Testamento 3) 220 p. Valencia 1983. Institución San Jeronimo.

BIENAIMÉ, Germain, *Moïse et le don de l'eau dans la tradition juive ancienne: targum et midrash* (Analecta Biblica 98). Roma 1984. Biblical Institute Press.

KIERNIKOWSKI, Zbigniew, «La crescita della comunità-corpo di Cristo. L'identità ed il dinamismo della vita cristiana rispecchiate nella dinamica del testo della lettera ai Colossesi» (estratto). 72 p. Roma 1983.

OLIVA, Manuel, *Jacob en Betel: Visión y voto (Gn 28,10-22). Estudio sobre la fuente E*. 148 p. Valencia 1975. Institución San Jeronimo.

LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

En este Elenco aparecen todos los libros enviados a *Biblica*, de alguna manera relacionados con los estudios bíblicos. La mención de un título en este Elenco no implica por tanto juicio alguno acerca de la obra. El consejo de dirección determina qué libros serán recensionados en *Biblica*.

Los libros y fascículos que non han sido expresamente pedidos por *Biblica* no serán devueltos al remitente, aún cuando no parezca conveniente publicar una recensión sobre ellos.

Todos los libros y fascículos enviados a *Biblica* se transmiten al Editor del *Elenchus bibliographicus biblicus*, y aparecen en él a juicio de dicho Editor.

Enviense los libros a: Dirección *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Via della Pilotta 25, 00187 Roma, Italia.

Vetus Testamentum

Armerding, Carl E., *The Old Testament and Criticism*. 134 p. 20,8 × 13,2. Grand Rapids, Michigan 1983. Eerdmans. £5.65.

Burns, Rita J., *Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers with Excursuses on Feasts/Ritual and Typology* (Old Testament Message 3). 298 p. 21 × 13,5. Wilmington, DL 1984. Michael Glazier, Inc. US \$8.95.

Coats, George W., *Genesis with an Introduction to Narrative Literature* (The Forms of the Old Testament Literature 1). XIII-322 p. 22,7 × 15,1. Grand Rapids MI 1983. Eerdmans. £17.80.

Emerson, Graci I. *Hosea an Israelite Prophet in Judean Perspective* (JSOT Supplement Series 28). XI-224 p. 21,5 × 13,1. Sheffield 1984. JSOT Press, Department of Biblical Studies.

Good, Robert, *The Sheep of His Pasture. A Study of the Hebrew Noun 'AM(M) and its Semitic Cognates* (Harvard Semitic Monographs 29). xv-198 p. 22,2 × 14,5. Chico CA 1983. Scholars Press. \$15.00.

Greenspahn, Frederick E., *Hapax Legomena in Biblical Hebrew. A Study of the Phenomenon and its Treatment Since Antiquity with Special Reference to Verbal Forms* (SBL Dissertation Series 74). XIII-260 p. 21,5 × 13,1. Chico CA 1984. Scholars Press. US \$10.95.

Halpern, Baruch, *The Emergence of Israel in Canaan* (SBL Monograph Series 29). 334 p. 22,7 × 14,9. Chico, CA 1984. Scholars Press. \$24.00.

The Holy Bible. The Two Books of Samuel (Japanese). 341 p. 20,2 × 15,3. Tokyo 1983. Chuo Shuppansha.

Huffman, H. B. – Spina, F. A. – Green, A. R. W. (Eds.), *The Quest For the Kingdom of God: Studies in Honor of George E. Mendenhall*. VIII-316 p. 23,5 × 15,8. Winona Lake, Indiana 1983. Eisenbrauns. US \$20.00.

Jeppesen, K. – Otzen, B. (Eds.), *The Productions of Time: Tradition History in Old Testament Scholarship. A Symposium at Sandjerg Manor, Denmark, May 1982* (Department of Old Testament Studies). 169 p. 21,5 × 13,5. Sheffield – Winona Lake, IN 1984. The Almond Press – Eisenbrauns. \$10.95.

Kaiser, Walter C., *Toward Old Testament Ethics*. XIII-345 p. 24 × 16,1. Exeter 1983. Paternoster Press. £13.95.

Klein, Ralph W., *1 Samuel* (Word Biblical Commentary 10). XXXIII-307 p. 23,5 × 16. Waco, Texas 1984. Word Books.

Klijn, Frederik A., *Der Lateinische Text der Apokalypse des Esra* (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur, Begründet von O. von Gebhardt und A. von Harnack 131). 108 p. 23,8 × 16,7. Berlin 1983. Akademie Verlag. DM, 48—.

Lacocque, André, *Daniel et son temps. Recherches sur le Mouvement Apocalyptique Juif au II^e siècle avant Jésus-Christ* (Le Monde de la Bible). Genève 1983. Labor et Fides.

Larcher, C., *Le Livre de la Sagesse ou La Sagesse de Salomon* (Etudes Bibliques, Nouvelle série 1). 311 p. 24,5 × 16. Paris 1983. J. Gabalda et Cie, Editeurs. FF. 270.

La Rondelle, Hans K., *The Israel of God in Prophecy. Principles of Prophetic Interpretation* (Andrews University Monographs, Studies in Religion, XIII). XIV-226 p. 22,7 × 15. Berrien Springs, MI 1983.

Lauha, Risto, *Psychophysischer Sprachgebrauch im Alten Testament. Eine Strukturalsemantische Analyse von לָבַד, נָפַח und מָח* (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae Dissertationes Humanarum Litterarum 35). 273 p. 25,1 × 17,5. Helsinki 1983.

Loretz, Oswald (Hrsg), *Der Prolog des Jesaja Buches* (1,1–2,5) (UBL Ugaritologische und Kolometrische Studien zum Jesaja-Buch, I). 171 p. 21 × 14,8. Soest – Altenberge 1984. Akademische Bibliothek – CIS Verlag.

Maiberger, Paul, *Topographische und historische Untersuchungen zum Sinaiprobblem. Worauf beruht die Identifizierung des Gabal Mūsā mit dem Sinai?* (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 54). 175 p. 23,5 × 17. Freiburg (Schweiz) – Göttingen 1984. Universitätsverlag – Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Martin-Achard, Robert, *Amos. L'homme, le message, l'influence* (Publications de la Faculté de Théologie de Genève n. 7). 320 p. 22,5 × 15. Genève 1984. Labor et Fides.

Meyers, C. – O'Connor, M. (Editors), *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Sixtieth Birthday* (American Schools of Oriental Research). xviii-742 p. 24,2 × 16,2. Philadelphia 1983. Eisenbrauns. \$35.00.

Origenes Werke. *Jeremiahomilien Klageliederkommentar Erklärung der Samuel- und Königsbücher.* Herausgegeben von Erich Klostermann. Bearbeitete Auflage herausgegeben von Pierre Nautin (Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte III). L-368 p. 24,5 × 17,5. Berlin 1983. Akademie-Verlag. DM 120,—.

Talstra, E., *II Kön 3 Etüden zur Textgrammatik* (Applicatio 1). 48 p. 23,5 × 15,6. Amsterdam 1983. Vu Boekhandel – Uitgeverij.

Trebolle-Barrera, Julio C., *Jehú y Joás.* Texto y composición literaria de 2 Reyes 9–11 (Institución San Jerónimo 17). 253 p. 24 × 16. Valencia 1984. Edilva.

Winter, Urs, *Frau und Göttin.* Exegetische und ikonographische Studien zum weiblichen Gottesbild im Alten Israel und in dessen Umwelt (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 53). 748 p. 15,9 × 23,5. Freiburg (Schweiz) – Göttingen 1983. Universitätsverlag – Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Novum Testamentum

Agbanou, Victor Kossi, *Le discours eschatologique de Matthieu 24–25: Tradition et rédaction* (Études Bibliques Nouvelle Série 2). 228 p. 25 × 16,3. Paris 1983. J. Gabalda et Cie Editeurs.

Bammel, E. – Moule, C. F. D., (Editors), *Jesus and the Politics of His Day.* 515 p. 23,5 × 15,7. Cambridge 1984. Cambridge University Press. £37.50.

Chilton, Bruce D., *A Galilean Rabbi And His Bible.* Jesus' Use of the Interpreted Scripture of His Time (Good News Studies 8). 213 p. 21 × 13,5. Wilmington DL 1984. Michael Glazier, Inc. \$7.95.

Clark, Elizabeth A., *Women in the Early Church* (Message of the Fathers of the Church 13). 260 p. 21,5 × 13,7. Wilmington, DL 1983. Michael Glazier, Inc. \$8.95.

Davies, W. D., *Jewish and Pauline Studies.* xi-419 p. 23,5 × 16,1. London 1984. SPCK. £25.00.

Delorme, Jean (Hrsg), *Zeichen und Gleichnisse.* Evangelientext und semiotische Forschung (Patmos Paperback). 220 p. 20,1 × 13,5. Düsseldorf 1979. Patmos Verlag.

Donne, Brian K., *Christ Ascended.* A Study in the Significance of the Ascension of Jesus Christ in the New Testament. xiii-98 p. 21,5 × 14. Exeter 1983. The Paternoster Press. £3.80.

Dreyfus, François, *Jésus savait-il qu'il était Dieu?* (Théologies/Apologétique). 130 p. 23,5 × 14,6. Paris 1984. Le Cerf. FF 82.

Farnedi, Giustino, *I simboli dell'iniziazione cristiana*. Atti del 1° congresso internazionale di liturgia, Pontificio Istituto Liturgico, 25-28 Maggio 1982 (Studia Anselmiana 87: Analecta Liturgica 7). 281 p. 24 × 17. Roma 1983. Edizioni Abbazia S. Paolo.

Firpo, Giulio, *Il problema cronologico della nascita di Gesù* (Biblioteca di Cultura Religiosa 42). 310 p. 20,8 × 14,8. Brescia 1983. Paideia Editrice. Lit. 18.000.

Gribomont, Jean, *Saint Basile, Evangile et Eglise*, Mélanges. Tome I (Spiritualité Orientale 36). xviii-257 p. 21 × 14,5. Bégrolles-en-Mauges 1984. Abbaye de Bellefontaine. FF 99.

Heriban, Jozef, *Retto ΦΡΟΝΕΙΝ e ΚΕΝΩΣΙΣ*. Studio esegetico su Fil 2,1-5.6-11. (Biblioteca di Scienze Religiose 51). 462 p. 24 × 16,5. Roma 1984. Libreria Ateneo Salesiano. Lit. 30.000

Horstmann, Johannes (Hrsg), *Und wer ist mein Nächster?* (Dokumentationen 5). 191 p. 20,5 × 14,7. Schwerte 1982. Katholische Akademie Schwerte.

Kühlschelm, Roman, *Jüngerverfolgung und Geschick Jesu*: Eine exegetisch-bibel-theologische Untersuchung der Synoptischen Verfolgungsankündigungen Mk 13,9-13 par und Mt 23,29-36 par (Österreichische Biblische Studien 5) hrsg von Wolfgang Beilner, Georg Braulik, Notker Fuglister and Jacob Kremer). 337 p. 21 × 14,7. Klosterneuburg 1983. Österreichisches Katholisches Bibelwerk. DM 49,50.

Lienhard, Joseph T., *Ministry*. (Message of the Fathers of the Church 8). 183 p. 21,6 × 14. Wilmington DL 1984. Michael Glazier, Inc. US \$7.95.

Logan, A. H. B. - Wedderburn, A. J. M., *The New Testament and Gnosis*: Essays in Honour of Robert McL. Wilson. xii-258 p. 22,2 × 14,3. Edinburgh 1983. T. & T. Clark Limited.

Maillot, Alphonse, *L'épître aux Romains*. Épître de l'œcuménisme et théologie de l'histoire. 382 p. 22,5 × 14,8. Paris - Genève 1984. Le Centurion - Labor et Fides.

Nestle-Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine*. 779 p. 16,2 × 11,15. Stuttgart 1984. Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

The New Testament in Greek III. The Gospel According to St. Luke. Part I: chapters 1-12; Edited by the American and British Committees of the International Greek New Testament Project. xvi-299 p. 27,5 × 21,5. Oxford 1984. Clarendon Press. £55.00.

Nida, E. A. - Louw, J. P. - Snyman, A. H. - Cronje, J. v W., *Style and Discourse*. With special reference to the Text of the Greek New Testament. 199 p. 21 × 15. New York, N.Y. 1983. Bible Society. \$5.95.

Perret, Jacques, *Ressuscité? Approche historique*. 97 p. 21 × 14,1. Paris 1984. FAC-Editions. FF 65.

Schnackenburg, Rudolf, *Das Johannesevangelium Ergänzende Auslegungen und Exkurse* (Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament IV). 236 p. 24,1 × 15,5. Freiburg – Basel – Wien 1984. Herder. DM 44,—.

Sider, Robert D., *The Gospel & Its Proclamation* (Message of the Fathers of the Church 10). 236 p. 21,5 × 13,7. Wilmington, DL 1983. Michael Glazier, Inc. US \$8.95.

Thiering, B. E., *The Qumran Origins of the Christian Church* (Theological Explorations). 315 p. 21,7 × 13,8. Sydney 1983. Australian and New Zealand Studies in Theology and Religion. \$A 14.50.

Tidball, Derek, *An Introduction to the Sociology of the New Testament*. 160 p. 21,5 × 14. Exeter 1983. The Paternoster Press. £4.20.

Varia

Berveling, Gerrit, *Apologio*. 116 p. 20 × 14,3. Vlaardingen 1982. Vöcoj Kristanaj.

Hanson, Paul D. (Ed.), *Visionaries and their Apocalypses* (Issues in Religion and Theology 2). 162 p. 21,6 × 13,3. Philadelphia – London 1983. Fortress Press – SPCK. \$3.50.

Holladay, Carl R., *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*; Volume I: Historians (SBL Texts and Translations 20, Pseudepigraphs 10). xiii-389 p. 22,9 × 15,2. Chico CA 1983. US \$16.50.

de Lubac, Henri, *Le drame de l'humanisme athée* (Traditions Chrétiennes 15). 540 p. 19,5 × 13,5. Paris 1983. Le Cerf. FF 90.

de Lubac, Henri, *La Révélation divine* (Traditions Chrétiennes 16). 190 p. 19,5 × 13,5. Paris 1983. Le Cerf. FF 45.

Mondin, Battista, *Introduzione alla teologia*. 382 p. 19,7 × 12,8. Milano 1983. Editrice Massimo. Lit. 15.000.

Muñoz León, Domingo, *Palabra y Gloria*. Excursus en la Biblia y en la Literatura Intertestamentaria (Verbum Glorae IV). 608 p. 24,5 × 17,2. Madrid 1983. C.S.I.C. Instituto «Francisco Suarez».

Neusner, Jacob, *Midrash in Context*. Exegesis in Formative Judaism. The Foundations of Judaism. Method, Teleology, Doctrine. Part One: Method. xxi-217 p. 23,5 × 15,8. Philadelphia 1983. Fortress Press.

Nicoletti, Michele, *La dialettica dell'Incarnazione*. Soggettività e storia nel pensiero di Sören Kierkegaard (Scienze religiose 5). 143 p. 21,7 × 14. Bologna 1983. Lit. 10.000.

Ogletree, Thomas W., *The Use of the Bible in Christian Ethics*. A Constructive Essay. xv-220 p. 22,2 × 14,7. Philadelphia 1983. Fortress Press.

Paddison, Ronan, *The Fragmented State*. The Political Geography of Power. 315 p. 23 × 15. Oxford 1983. Basil Blackwell. £7,95.

Scholem, Gershom, *Le Nom et les symboles de Dieu dans la mystique juive* (Patrimoines Judaïsme). Traduction de Maurice R. Hayoun et Georges Vajda. 204 p. 23,5 × 14,5. Paris 1983. Le Cerf. FF 106.

Stalley, R. F. (Ed.), *An Introduction to Plato's Laws*. 208 p. 22,3 × 14,2. Oxford 1983. Basil Blackwell. £15.

Sutton, Keith, *The People of God*. Pictures in a Gallery. VIII-110 p. 18 × 11. London 1983. SPCK. £1.50.

Tadmor, H. - **Weinfeld**, M. (Editors), *History, Historiography and Interpretation*. Studies in Biblical and Cuneiform Literatures. 192 p. 23 × 15,5. Jerusalem 1983. The Magnes Press - The Hebrew University. \$18.00.

Thornton, Martin, *Spiritual Direction*. A Practical Introduction. 145 p. 21,7 × 13,5. London 1983 SPCK. £5,95.

Tobin, Thomas H., *The Creation of Man: Philo and the History of Interpretation* (The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 14). VIII-199 p. 15,3 × 22,9. Washington, D.C. 1983. The Catholic Biblical Association of America. US \$6.00.

Uehlinger, Christoph von, *Hebräische Lieder*. 53 p. 21 × 14,8. Fribourg/Schweiz 1983. Schweizerisches Katholisches Bibelwerk.

van Seters, John, *In Search of History*. Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History. XIII-399 p. 16 × 24. New Haven - London 1983. Yale University Press. £27.00.

von Balthasar, Hans Urs, *La Gloire et la Croix*. Les aspects esthétiques de la Révélation IV. Le domaine de la métaphysique *** Les Héritages (Théologie 86). 410 p. 20,9 × 13,3. Paris 1983. Aubier Montaigne. FF 95.

ISSN 0006-0887

PIETRO BOCCACCIO, Direttore Responsabile

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa

SCUOLA TIPOGRAFICA S. PIO X - VIA DEGLI ETRUSCHI, 7-9 ROMA - Luglio 1984